Artists Ahead of the Church: Recovering the Double Register of Divine Intimacy Without Sentimentality

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

December 21, 2025

Many modern churches speak often of “relationship with God,” yet frequently struggle to name, host, and disciple the full range of human interiority that such a relationship entails. In contrast, great sacred art and devotionally charged literature often carry a “double register”: the primary register is God-human (the transcendent meeting the immanent), while a secondary register borrows the grammar of romance and embodied intimacy to render that encounter intelligible to ordinary human experience. This paper argues that the double register is neither a modern confusion nor a theological embarrassment, but an ancient Christian resource with deep biblical roots, mature historical expression, and practical pastoral utility. When handled with reverence and audit-friendly discernment, this idiom helps communities avoid two opposite failures: sterilized faith that cannot speak to longing, and undisciplined intensity that confuses affect with truth. We examine where the double register appears in Scripture, hymnody, mysticism, and sacred art; why it tends to outpace contemporary ecclesial speech; what risks it introduces; and how churches can recover it without eroticizing worship or collapsing doctrine into vibes. The goal is a usable framework: intimacy with God that is emotionally honest, theologically bounded, and fruit-tested in lived formation.

Keywords: double register, divine intimacy, transcendence and immanence, Song of Songs, mystical theology, sacred art, hymnody, Baroque devotion, spiritual formation, discernment, reverence plus audit, affect and truth, embodied prayer, theosis, Pentecostal spirituality, ecclesial aesthetics.

A collaboration with GPT-5.2-Thinking. 51 pages. CC4.0.

Outline

1. Framing the Problem: Why the Arts Can Feel Ahead of the Church
1.1 The pastoral gap between “relationship” language and lived interiority
1.2 Institution versus artist: risk, scandal management, and emotional bandwidth
1.3 The double register defined: primary sacred, secondary romantic by design
1.4 Scope and limits: this paper as a formation and language proposal

2. The Double Register as a Christian Inheritance
2.1 Biblical roots: covenant, longing, shelter, and union language
2.2 Song of Songs as template: literal love poem and theological reading
2.3 New Testament continuities: love, abiding, adoption, and bride imagery
2.4 What the tradition is not: erotics as metaphor versus erotics as method

3. How Sacred Art Makes the Invisible Legible
3.1 Incarnation logic: why the body cannot be bypassed
3.2 Baroque “total artwork”: attention, affect, and staged devotion
3.3 Case study: ecstasy imagery and the problem of modern misreadings
3.4 The viewer as participant: how art trains reception and response

4. Hymnody and Devotional Speech: Intimacy Anchored to Christ
4.1 “Lover language” that remains doctrinally bounded
4.2 Desire transposed: longing as sanctified energy
4.3 Congregational pedagogy: how repeated singing forms a soul
4.4 Failure modes: sentimentality, manipulation, and the collapse into performance

5. The Mystics: Union Without Illusion
5.1 Why mystics speak in paradox and metaphor
5.2 Purification and truth: union language under the discipline of the cross
5.3 Distinguishing consolation, ecstasy, and holiness
5.4 Reading mystics safely: formation rules for ordinary believers

6. Eastern and Western Patterns: Two Ways of Guarding Intimacy
6.1 Theosis and participation: intimacy without eroticization
6.2 Western affect and imagery: intimacy through embodied metaphor
6.3 Complementarity: when each tradition corrects the other
6.4 A synthesis option for contemporary churches

7. A Discernment Framework: Reverence Plus Audit
7.1 The primary-register test: is God named and centered explicitly
7.2 The secondary-register test: metaphor as bridge, not destination
7.3 The fruit test: humility, charity, steadiness, obedience
7.4 The cross test: union language that does not bypass cruciform life
7.5 The no-oracle rule: resisting intensity as epistemic proof

8. Practical Recommendations for Church Life
8.1 Preaching Song of Songs without embarrassment or gimmickry
8.2 Worship design: cultivating depth without erotic drift
8.3 Discipleship practices: attention, confession, community accountability
8.4 Pastoral safeguards: trauma sensitivity, boundaries, and healthy embodiment
8.5 Re-learning a vocabulary of longing: words that mature desire

9. Objections and Clarifications
9.1 “This makes worship sexual”
9.2 “This reduces theology to psychology”
9.3 “This invites mysticism and error”
9.4 “This is culturally dated”
9.5 What can and cannot be claimed by this model

10. Conclusion: Recovering a Language Capable of God
10.1 Restating the thesis: the double register as a formation tool
10.2 The promised outcome: honest intimacy without loss of truth
10.3 A closing charge: depth with discernment, tenderness with doctrine

11. References
11.1 Scripture and primary theological sources
11.2 Hymnody and devotional literature
11.3 Mystical theology and spiritual formation scholarship
11.4 Art history and aesthetics of devotion
11.5 Psychology of emotion, attention, and religious experience

Art

1. Framing the Problem: Why the Arts Can Feel Ahead of the Church

In many congregations, the phrase “a relationship with God” functions as a summary of the Christian life. It is meant to be warm, accessible, and personal; it is also meant to distinguish faith from mere ethics, cultural identity, or intellectual assent. Yet for many believers, that language remains strangely thin at the precise point where it is supposed to be thick: at the level of lived interiority. People know what a relationship is in human terms. They know what love feels like, what longing feels like, what absence feels like, what fear feels like, what reunion feels like. When the church speaks of relationship but cannot name these interior textures without embarrassment, anxiety, or vagueness, a gap opens between the official vocabulary and the actual life of the soul. Into that gap, art often steps with startling competence.

The claim that “artists are ahead of our churches” is not a sneer at doctrine or an attempt to replace worship with aesthetics. It is an observation about communicative bandwidth. Great sacred art, hymnody, and mystical writing frequently speak with an intimacy and an emotional precision that churches sometimes avoid. They can do so without necessarily becoming doctrinally sloppy, because they are operating with different tools: image, metaphor, rhythm, posture, gesture, and narrative. In the best cases, these tools do not compete with theology; they give theology a body. But when churches lose this capacity, art can feel like a missing organ of the Christian witness: an organ that knows how to render transcendence into humanly graspable experience without reducing God to the human.

This section frames the problem in four movements. First, it identifies a pastoral gap between “relationship” language and lived interiority. Second, it explains why institutions tend to lag behind artists in this domain: not because faith is shallow, but because institutions bear distinct responsibilities and fears. Third, it defines the “double register” that makes so many works of sacred art and lyric feel powerful: the primary register is God-human (transcendent-immanent), while a secondary register borrows the grammar of romance, longing, and embodied intimacy. Fourth, it sets the scope of the paper: not to litigate “the right amount of emotion,” but to propose a disciplined vocabulary and a formation-friendly method that churches can use without sliding into manipulation or confusion.

1.1 The pastoral gap between “relationship” language and lived interiority

“Relationship” language promises immediacy. It tells the believer: God is not merely an object of speculation, nor merely a distant lawgiver, but a living presence who calls, teaches, corrects, sustains, and loves. Yet in practice, many people experience one of two failures of translation.

The first failure is thinness. Relationship becomes a slogan. It means “try harder, be better, show up, behave,” but it does not help a person interpret interior experiences: dryness, distraction, doubt, longing, numbness, grief, fear, shame, joy, awe, or sudden peace. The believer is left with

a mismatch: life is thick, but the church's language is thin. When someone says, "I drift away," "I cannot stay in the line," "I need you to keep my head above the water," they are not being poetic for entertainment; they are naming the felt phenomenology of spiritual life. If the church responds only with "read your Bible more" or "be more disciplined," it might be giving true counsel, but it is not meeting the human in the full register of the human. The person hears: your experience is either irrelevant or suspicious.

The second failure is the opposite: inflation. Some communities respond to interiority by over-validating it. The believer's felt intensity becomes the measure of spiritual reality. The result is a spirituality of volatility: high highs, low lows, constant chasing, anxiety when the feeling fades, and sometimes a subtle pressure to perform. In this environment, relationship language becomes a demand for emotional proof. That can be spiritually exhausting and psychologically destabilizing, especially for those who are temperamentally steady, trauma-affected, depressed, anxious, or neurologically different. The church may intend warmth, but the lived effect can be a tyranny of affect.

Between thinness and inflation lies a third option: mature intimacy. Mature intimacy does not deny interiority, and it does not enthrone interiority. It can say, "Yes, you are afraid, and yes, fear is part of faith's terrain," while also saying, "Fear is not your oracle." It can say, "Yes, longing is real," while also saying, "Longing is not permission to remake God in your image." Mature intimacy requires a vocabulary capacious enough to speak to real experience and a discipline strong enough to keep experience from becoming the final authority. When the church lacks this, art often becomes the place where people go to find words for what their faith is already living but cannot yet name.

1.2 Institution versus artist: risk, scandal management, and emotional bandwidth

Why does this gap persist? Part of the answer is institutional ecology. Churches are not only communities of worship; they are also guardians of formation across a wide range of ages, histories, trauma profiles, and moral maturity. They have a duty to protect the vulnerable, to avoid scandal, and to speak in ways that do not easily trigger confusion, exploitation, or misinterpretation. In that sense, caution is not cowardice; it is a form of love.

But caution has costs. Institutions often become allergic to ambiguity, and the interior life is inherently ambiguous. A hymn line can name longing without specifying whether the longing is holy desire, ordinary loneliness, unresolved grief, or a mix of all three. A sculpture can portray ecstasy without footnoting the difference between spiritual union and sensual arousal. An artist can take that risk because the work is not tasked with shepherding every viewer into mature interpretation. Churches, by contrast, feel the weight of responsibility: if we say this, will people

misunderstand? If we depict this, will we ignite something unhealthy? If we encourage intimacy language, will that become a doorway to manipulation?

This produces a predictable institutional reflex: flatten the language and narrow the imagery. Reduce the possibility of scandal by reducing the expressive range. The problem is that the human heart does not become safer when language becomes smaller; the heart becomes more clandestine. People still experience longing, absence, and desire; they simply learn not to bring it to church. The unspoken interior life then migrates elsewhere: into private fantasy, into romantic entanglements, into addictions, into secret shame, or into art consumed without formation.

Artists, meanwhile, are not constrained by the same pastoral obligations. They can explore the boundary spaces precisely because those boundary spaces are where many humans actually live. They can say what institutions hesitate to say. They can portray spiritual intensity in a way that startles, awakens, or offends. This is why it can feel as though artists are ahead: they are willing to risk discomfort to communicate truth at the level of lived experience.

Yet the church's task is not to become reckless. The church's task is to recover emotional and imaginative bandwidth while remaining formation-centered. This means learning to speak in a richer idiom without abandoning doctrinal boundaries and without outsourcing discernment to mere individual preference. It also means acknowledging that the Christian tradition already contains models of how to do this well, including within communities that cared deeply about moral seriousness.

1.3 The double register defined: primary sacred, secondary romantic by design

The "double register" is a disciplined way of describing a phenomenon that believers intuit immediately when they hear it: language that sounds like romance but aims at God.

In the primary register, the subject is God's action and God's reality: transcendence meeting the immanent human. The core claims are theological, even when implicit: God sustains, God calls, God rescues, God forms, God loves, God is worthy. The language carries a vertical dimension: not simply "you and I," but "Creature addressed by Creator," "soul addressed by God," "the finite held by the infinite."

In the secondary register, the language borrows from human intimacy: arms, longing, absence, desire to be near, fear of drifting away, being held, being taught, being rescued, being carried, being seen. This register is not the main claim; it is the metaphorical vehicle that makes the primary claim experientially legible. The secondary register is a bridge from the known to the unknown: from human relational grammar to divine communion.

When the double register is healthy, it does not collapse the primary into the secondary. God is not reduced to "my romantic partner in the sky," and faith is not reduced to mood management. The romantic grammar is used as a humanly accessible symbol set for truths that exceed literal description. The point is not erotic arousal; the point is communion, trust, surrender, and sustaining love.

When the double register becomes unhealthy, it collapses. Either the primary register becomes so vague that the lyrics could be addressed to anyone, and God disappears into a generalized "you," or the secondary register becomes so dominant that worship turns into romantic roleplay. The resulting confusion is real, and it explains why many churches hesitate. But the existence of abuse does not invalidate proper use. It calls for discernment, not silence.

A key claim of this paper is that the double register is not a trick of modern pop music. It is a long-standing Christian idiom, with biblical and historical pedigree. It is also a psychologically realistic idiom, because the human heart understands love primarily through relational metaphors. If the church refuses those metaphors entirely, it risks producing a faith that is correct but emotionally unreachable.

1.4 Scope and limits: this paper as a formation and language proposal

This paper is not a campaign for "more emotional worship," nor a critique of doctrine, nor a claim that aesthetics should govern theology. It is a formation proposal: a way to recover a richer Christian vocabulary for divine intimacy that is disciplined by truth and tested by fruit.

The scope is practical and pastoral. We will look at where the double register appears in Christian sources and practices, why it has power, and why it can go wrong. We will propose a framework that churches can use to evaluate and employ this idiom without sliding into two common distortions: sterile faith that cannot name longing, or sentimental faith that makes feelings the measure of reality.

The limits matter. This paper does not attempt to prove that particular mystical experiences are authentic. It does not attempt to adjudicate controversies about specific artists, songs, or devotions. It also does not attempt to settle deep theological debates about the relation of affect to faith, or about the role of aesthetics in worship, beyond what is necessary for a workable proposal.

Instead, the paper aims for something modest but urgently needed: a shared language. If believers cannot speak honestly about fear, drift, longing, and sustaining grace, they will either hide those realities or interpret them through whatever sources are loudest and least accountable. The church does not need to imitate every artist. But it does need to regain a capacity that the best of the tradition already possessed: the ability to speak about God with enough intimacy to be real, and enough discipline to remain true.

When that capacity returns, the sentence “artists are ahead of our churches” begins to change. It becomes less an accusation and more an invitation: a reminder that Christianity has always had an imagination, and that the imagination, properly formed, can serve holiness rather than compete with it.

2. The Double Register as a Christian Inheritance

The double register is not a modern workaround for modern emotional needs. It is not an import from pop romance into religion. It is an inheritance: an established Christian way of speaking that arises because the subject matter demands it. God is not an object among objects, and the human person is not a detached spectator. If the Christian claim is that God addresses persons, makes covenant, draws near, sustains life, and calls for trust and love, then language inevitably reaches for relational metaphors. Scripture does this from beginning to end. The tradition that follows Scripture continues the same pattern, sometimes with careful restraint, sometimes with daring intensity, but almost always with the same underlying logic: love is the closest everyday grammar humans have for communion, and covenant is the closest public grammar humans have for binding commitment. The double register exists because the Christian life is not merely assent to propositions; it is a lived relation that includes longing, refuge, discipline, and union.

This section argues that the double register is best understood as a family of biblical idioms rather than as a single technique. Covenant language gives it moral structure. Longing language gives it emotional truthfulness. Shelter language gives it existential realism. Union language gives it a telos. The Song of Songs then provides an explicit template for the double register: a text that is undeniably a love poem and yet has been read, in disciplined ways, as theological speech. The New Testament deepens the pattern by shifting emphasis toward abiding, adoption, and the bride imagery of Christ and the Church. Finally, we clarify what the inheritance is not. The tradition uses erotics as metaphorical vehicle; it does not institute erotics as method. It borrows romance grammar to point beyond romance, not to turn worship into romance.

2.1 Biblical roots: covenant, longing, shelter, and union language

A Christian account of divine intimacy begins with covenant. Covenant is not merely a contract; it is a relational bond with moral seriousness. It frames intimacy as faithful commitment rather than as mood. In covenant, love is not primarily a feeling; it is a pledged orientation that persists through change, drought, betrayal, and repair. This is why covenant is such a stabilizing force for the double register. It prevents divine intimacy from drifting into mere emotionalism because covenant language carries public, ethical, and historical weight. To speak of God’s love

covenantally is to speak of a love that binds itself, carries obligations, and does not evaporate when the beloved becomes difficult.

From covenant flows longing. Scripture is unembarrassed about longing, desire, thirst, hunger, and pursuit. These are not presented as merely romantic impulses; they are treated as spiritual facts. The biblical writers assume that humans are made for communion, and therefore absence hurts. If God is near, it is experienced as life. If God feels hidden, it is experienced as dryness or grief. Longing language is not an optional poetic flourish; it is the only honest way to speak when the heart knows it was made for more than distraction can satisfy. In this sense, longing is not a threat to faith; it is often faith's most truthful symptom.

Shelter language is the third root. Many biblical images of divine love are not soft or sentimental; they are protective, rescuing, stabilizing. Refuge, fortress, wings, shepherding, deliverance, being lifted from water, being upheld, being carried: these metaphors render divine intimacy as existential dependence. Here the double register shows its depth. Intimacy with God is not only about "feeling close." It is also about being kept alive. That is why certain lines that sound romantic on the surface ("hold me," "keep me," "stay near") are, in biblical terms, survival language. They name the reality that human life is fragile, and that the creature's most basic security is not self-generated.

Union language is the fourth root, and it is both the most powerful and the most misread. Union, in Christian tradition, is not fusion. It is not the erasure of the person. It is communion: participation without collapse, nearness without absorption, belonging without annihilation. Scripture's ways of speaking about union vary: "abiding," "dwelling," "being in," "one body," "members," "temple," "filled," "clothed," "sealed." The point is consistent: divine intimacy aims at a real participation in God's life, and the language strains because the reality is not fully representable in ordinary categories. Human love becomes the nearest analog, but it is not equal in scale. Romance can hint; only God can complete.

Taken together, covenant, longing, shelter, and union provide a disciplined map for the double register. Covenant prevents intimacy from becoming mere sensation. Longing prevents faith from becoming sterile. Shelter prevents relationship language from becoming therapeutic abstraction. Union prevents Christianity from becoming mere moralism. These biblical roots explain why the tradition continues to speak in relational metaphors: it is following the grain of Scripture's own speech.

2.2 Song of Songs as template: literal love poem and theological reading

The Song of Songs is the classic test case because it does not hide its literal layer. It is erotic poetry. It speaks of desire, attraction, bodily presence, delight, separation, seeking, reunion, and praise of beauty. It is not embarrassed by the physical. It does not apologize for love. That alone

is important: the Bible contains, in its canon, a text that treats embodied love as worthy of poetic celebration. This fact disrupts any Christian instinct to treat bodily desire as automatically shameful or automatically outside the sphere of holy speech.

And yet the Song has also been read theologically across centuries. The key point is not that every allegorical reading is equally wise, but that the impulse to read the Song in relation to God is not arbitrary. It arises because Scripture itself repeatedly uses spousal metaphors for covenant. When a tradition has already learned to speak of God's covenantal bond in marital terms, it is not surprising that it would see in a canonical love poem an image-rich reservoir for divine love. The Song becomes a template: it shows that romance grammar can be used to speak of ultimate attachment, ultimate desire, ultimate fidelity, and ultimate joy.

A disciplined theological reading of the Song does not deny the literal love poem. It holds the literal and the theological together without forcing one to cancel the other. The literal layer reminds the reader that created love is good and meaningful. The theological layer reminds the reader that created love, at its best, can function as a sign: a creaturely icon of a deeper communion. This is the heart of the double register: the secondary register is not a disguise. It is a sign. It borrows the most intense relational grammar humans know in order to gesture toward a communion that surpasses it.

But the Song also provides a warning. Because it is vivid, it can tempt readers toward ungrounded speculation, or toward turning spirituality into a romance narrative. The tradition's best interpreters therefore paired Song of Songs reading with moral seriousness, humility, and the broader canonical witness. They treated it as a text for mature readers, or at least as a text that requires formation. In practical terms, the Song teaches the church that the double register is possible and legitimate, but it also teaches the church that the double register is not self-interpreting. It must be held within covenant, truth, and fruit.

2.3 New Testament continuities: love, abiding, adoption, and bride imagery

The New Testament does not abandon the double register; it intensifies and stabilizes it. Yet it does so with a distinctive emphasis. Where some Old Testament imagery leans heavily on spousal covenant as public metaphor, the New Testament widens the relational vocabulary: friendship, family, adoption, abiding, indwelling, and the corporate bride.

First, love becomes explicit and central. The New Testament treats love not as ornament but as the summary of the fulfilled life in God. This love is not merely human love projected upward; it is understood as originating in God and then forming the believer. This matters for the double register because it clarifies directionality. The primary register is God's love given, God's life shared, God's initiative. The believer's longing and response are secondary. That order protects

the church from turning spirituality into self-generated romance. The initiative is divine; the response is human.

Second, abiding language gives union a sober frame. “Abide” suggests sustained, steady, relational presence over time. It is not primarily ecstatic language. It is the language of remaining, dwelling, staying, continuing. Abiding is exactly what many churches need if they are to recover intimacy without chasing highs. It says: communion is not a spike. Communion is a life-pattern. It also provides language for drift. If the believer “drifts away,” the answer is not necessarily to manufacture intensity but to return, remain, dwell, practice staying.

Third, adoption language protects intimacy from eroticization. Adoption is intimate love without sexual connotation. It is belonging, inheritance, being named, being received, being secured. For believers uncomfortable with romantic metaphors, adoption is a deep alternative register that still communicates nearness and dependence. It also protects against manipulation: if God is Father and believers are adopted, then God is not a lover to be seduced or appeased but a Father who gives, disciplines, and secures.

Fourth, bride imagery preserves the spousal metaphor while placing it within a corporate and eschatological frame. The New Testament’s bride imagery is not primarily about private romance; it is about covenant destiny and communal belonging. The Church, not merely the individual, is the bride. This corrects a common modern distortion where “Jesus is my boyfriend” becomes a private emotional script. In the New Testament frame, bride language points toward holiness, fidelity, preparation, and ultimate union, not toward romantic self-indulgence.

Taken together, the New Testament offers a multi-register model of divine intimacy. It does not force every believer into one metaphor. It provides a family of relational grammars, all of which can carry the double register in healthy ways. The primary register remains divine action and divine reality; the secondary register remains human relational grammar, deployed to make the primary intelligible. But the New Testament strengthens guardrails by emphasizing initiative, abiding, adoption, and corporate identity.

2.4 What the tradition is not: erotics as metaphor versus erotics as method

Because the double register borrows romantic grammar, it is vulnerable to misunderstanding. Some critics assume that if romance language appears, the goal must be erotic stimulation. Some defenders, in reaction, deny that romance language exists at all and attempt to sanitize the tradition into purely abstract terms. Both mistakes miss the point.

The tradition uses erotics as metaphorical vehicle, not as method. That is, it employs the language of desire, longing, and union to indicate a spiritual reality, but it does not instruct believers to generate erotic states as a pathway to God. The method of Christian communion is

not erotic technique. The method is prayer, obedience, repentance, sacrament, community, service, contemplation, and the steady discipline of love. The affective life may be transformed in the process, but affect is not the lever that moves God.

This distinction matters because it is one of the church's legitimate fears: the fear of confusion, the fear of predation, the fear of making worship unsafe. The double register can be abused when a leader intentionally blurs the line between spiritual authority and romantic or sexual dynamics, or when a community teaches that intensity equals holiness. The tradition's healthiest streams explicitly resist such blur. They insist that love for God is not proven by arousal, and that union is not achieved by technique.

A second clarifying point follows. The double register is not a license for vagueness. A common modern pattern is to write worship songs addressed to "you" in a way that could be sung to a romantic partner without any change. This is not the classical double register; it is often a collapse of the primary register. In the classical pattern, the primary register is anchored: God is named, Christ is confessed, the story of salvation is present, the moral shape of the relationship is covenantal. The secondary register then functions as an intensifier and humanizer, not as a substitute.

A third clarification is pastoral: different believers need different primary metaphors. Some will be helped by spousal language; others will be troubled by it because of trauma, misunderstanding, or temperament. The New Testament already provides alternatives: adoption, friendship, shepherding, body-and-membership, temple indwelling, and abiding. A wise church does not force one metaphor into universal dominance. It teaches the family of images and gives people permission to lean where their formation can be healthy.

So the inheritance is clear. Christianity has long known how to speak of God in intimate terms without turning God into a romantic object. It has long known that human desire is not automatically unholy but must be disciplined, transposed, and matured. It has long known that the body is not an enemy, but neither is it a compass that never lies. The double register, at its best, is the language of that mature realism: covenantal, honest, sheltering, and aimed at communion rather than sensation.

3. How Sacred Art Makes the Invisible Legible

Sacred art often feels "ahead" of contemporary church speech because it solves a problem the church regularly inherits but does not always address directly: how to speak about a God who is invisible, transcendent, and not reducible to concepts, while still addressing embodied humans who learn, remember, and love through sensation, image, rhythm, and place. Theology can state truths about God with precision, but the human person does not live by propositions

alone. The heart must learn how to attend. The will must learn how to yield. The imagination must learn how to carry the weight of an unseen reality without turning it into fantasy. Sacred art offers a disciplined way of making the invisible legible, not by proving God, but by shaping the conditions under which a person can receive, contemplate, and respond.

This section argues that sacred art works because it is incarnation-shaped. It assumes that the human person is not a floating intellect but a creature whose body, perception, and affect are integral to spiritual life. It then explores how Baroque art, in particular, becomes a "total artwork" that engineers attention and devotion through integrated design. From there we revisit the issue that often provokes modern discomfort: ecstasy imagery that can be misread as erotic. Finally, we examine a core function of sacred art that churches sometimes underestimate: it trains the viewer. It makes the viewer a participant. It forms habits of reception and response in a way that is difficult to achieve with abstract instruction alone.

3.1 Incarnation logic: why the body cannot be bypassed

The Christian claim is not merely that God exists, but that God draws near in a way that addresses humans as humans. Incarnation is not an accessory doctrine; it is a statement about method. If God meets the world through flesh, then spiritual life cannot be reduced to disembodied cognition. This is not a romanticization of the body; it is an acknowledgment of what humans are. People are formed by what they see repeatedly, what they touch, what they hear, where they stand, and how their attention is trained. Even when a church aims at purely "spiritual" communication, it inevitably uses embodied channels: voice tone, architecture, lighting, the cadence of prayers, the order of worship, the posture of the congregation, the aesthetics of the space. There is no bypass.

Sacred art simply admits this and works with it intentionally. It treats perception as a spiritual doorway, not as a rival to truth. When a person stands before an icon, a sculpture, or a stained-glass window, the artwork is not merely conveying information. It is inviting a posture: stillness, contemplation, reverence, receptivity. In that sense, sacred art is not only content; it is pedagogy. It teaches the soul how to look.

This matters because one reason "relationship language" becomes thin in modern church life is that it is often delivered as concept without practice. People hear that God is near, but the culture trains their attention to be scattered and frantic. They hear that prayer is real, but their inner world is dominated by distraction and anxiety. Art can become a counter-training: a discipline of presence. It slows the viewer down, not by argument, but by giving the eye and mind something structured enough to hold.

The body also matters because spiritual life includes affect. Fear, longing, awe, grief, joy, shame, gratitude: these are not optional side effects. They are part of how humans perceive meaning

and respond to reality. The question is not whether affect will be present, but whether it will be formed or left to chaos. Sacred art does not pretend to eliminate affect; it seeks to order it. In that ordering, the double register becomes visible: art can portray tenderness, rescue, longing, union, and transformation without needing to reduce these realities to a set of instructions.

3.2 Baroque "total artwork": attention, affect, and staged devotion

Baroque sacred art is a particularly clear instance of art functioning as formation because it is intentionally immersive. It does not merely decorate a chapel; it constructs an encounter. The goal is not spectacle for its own sake but devotion by way of heightened perception. The Baroque instinct is that the whole environment can be arranged to direct attention toward divine realities: architecture guiding the body, light guiding the eye, sculpture guiding the imagination, and spatial choreography guiding the heart.

This is what is meant by "total artwork": multiple elements unified to produce a coherent spiritual experience. The viewer is not asked to admire the artist's cleverness; the viewer is drawn into a narrative of divine action. The space becomes a kind of theater, but not a theater of fiction. It is a theater of participation, where the believer is placed inside a designed frame that makes response more likely: awe, reverence, penitence, gratitude, hope.

Importantly, Baroque devotion is not naive about distraction. It assumes that humans are hard to hold. They drift. Their eyes wander. Their minds wander. So it builds a "channel" for attention. It provides a focal center. It uses contrast, scale, motion in drapery, the directionality of lines, and the drama of light to produce a kind of attentional gravity. In modern terms, it is an attention technology, but one ordered toward worship rather than consumption.

This is also why Baroque art can feel more psychologically literate than some modern church environments. Modern worship spaces sometimes pursue neutrality: plain walls, minimal imagery, functional lighting, the assumption that "pure word" is enough. Sometimes it is. But in a culture that trains the nervous system toward constant novelty, neutrality does not necessarily produce purity. It can produce drift. Baroque art, by contrast, assumes that devotion requires a shaped environment. It assumes that love is trained, not merely declared.

3.3 Case study: ecstasy imagery and the problem of modern misreadings

The modern controversy around ecstasy imagery typically arises from a mismatch of formation. Many modern viewers have been trained to interpret bodily intensity primarily through a sexual lens, and they live in a media environment that monetizes arousal and scandal. When such viewers encounter a work that depicts spiritual ecstasy through bodily expression, they may read it as erotic or even pornographic. They then conclude either that the art is corrupt or that the church is hypocritical. Both conclusions can be too quick.

To understand ecstasy imagery within the Christian inheritance, two distinctions are essential. First, bodily expression does not automatically equal sexual meaning. The human body expresses many extremes: pain, release, grief, relief, terror, awe, peace, surrender. A face that looks “ecstatic” can be read as orgasmic only if one assumes that sexual arousal is the primary key for bodily intensity. But spiritual traditions often describe divine encounter as overwhelming, and the body participates in that overwhelm because the body participates in human life. The depiction of ecstasy is not necessarily sexual; it is often an attempt to show what cannot be shown: the collision between finite creature and infinite love.

Second, even when spiritual writings use language that resembles erotic longing, the intention is frequently transposition rather than indulgence. The tradition does not say, “Make worship erotic.” It says, “Human longing is powerful; it can be purified and redirected toward God.” The ecstasy that mystics describe is not pursued as sensation; it is often received as gift, sometimes with fear, sometimes with reluctance, and almost always within a broader life of discipline, repentance, and service. When art depicts such moments, it is not necessarily celebrating sensation; it is often portraying surrender.

Modern misreadings tend to happen when the viewer lacks the interpretive grammar of transposition. Without that grammar, the viewer sees only one thing: sex. With that grammar, the viewer can see something else: the tradition’s attempt to speak about union, grace, and divine invasion of the self in a way that does justice to intensity without making intensity the goal.

There is a legitimate caution here. Some works may lean toward sensationalism. Some viewers may use sacred imagery as pretext for voyeurism. Some communities may mishandle intimacy language and create unsafe spaces. Those realities are not denied. But the existence of misuse does not erase the intended meaning of the best works. It simply reinforces the paper’s thesis: the double register requires formation. It is not self-interpreting.

3.4 The viewer as participant: how art trains reception and response

Perhaps the most underappreciated function of sacred art is that it trains the viewer. It does not merely communicate ideas; it forms habits of attention, receptivity, and response. In that sense, sacred art is closer to liturgy than to illustration. It is an aid to prayer, not merely an object of critique.

Art trains reception in several ways. It slows time. A painting or sculpture does not scroll. It does not update. It does not demand immediate reaction. It invites lingering. That lingering is itself spiritual practice: the practice of staying with a reality long enough for the soul to begin to hear what it is actually saying. In a culture that trains quick takes, sacred art retrains deep seeing.

Art also trains response by giving the believer a safe object for contemplation. Many people cannot “feel God” on demand. Many people find purely internal prayer difficult because their mind is noisy. Art provides an external anchor. It gives the mind a stable form to return to again and again. This is not idolatry; it is the use of a created aid to stabilize attention. The result can be a more realistic and humane spirituality: not dependent on constant inner fireworks, but supported by steady practices.

Finally, art trains discernment by making ambiguity visible. A viewer can sense both registers at once: tenderness and awe, beauty and fear, desire and reverence. Art does not always resolve the tension. It asks the viewer to hold it without collapsing it. That is a spiritual skill. Many church environments, by contrast, seek immediate closure: “Here is the point, here is the takeaway, now apply.” That approach has strengths, but it can unintentionally teach the soul to avoid mystery. Sacred art can teach the opposite: to remain present before mystery without panicking, without trivializing, and without inventing false certainty.

In this way, sacred art becomes a school for the “reverence plus audit” posture. Reverence, because it draws the viewer into awe and humility. Audit, because it forces the viewer to notice what is happening inside: what the image awakens, what it tempts, what it heals, what it confuses. The viewer learns to watch their own reception. They learn to distinguish attraction from communion, arousal from awe, sentiment from love, spectacle from devotion. This is not automatic; it requires guidance. But when the church provides that guidance, sacred art becomes not a threat but a partner in formation.

The larger point of this section is simple. Sacred art makes the invisible legible by honoring how humans actually perceive and respond. It offers an incarnational pedagogy of attention and affection. When churches recover that pedagogy, the arts no longer appear “ahead” as though they are rivals. They appear as allies: older siblings in the tradition who learned, through form, how to speak the truth in a voice the whole human can hear.

4. Hymnody and Devotional Speech: Intimacy Anchored to Christ

If sacred art makes the invisible legible through sight, hymnody and devotional speech do so through voice. They take the double register and place it on the tongue, where it can be repeated, remembered, and carried into ordinary life. This is one reason hymnody has been so formative across centuries: it does not merely state doctrine; it teaches a people how to feel doctrine truthfully. It offers a language for fear, longing, gratitude, confession, and hope that is not private improvisation but shared inheritance. When this language is healthy, it is intimate without being vague, tender without being sentimental, and affective without being coercive. It

is “anchored to Christ,” meaning that the primary register remains explicit: the “you” is not an interchangeable beloved but the living Lord confessed by the Church.

In many contemporary settings, worship music can drift toward generality. A congregation may sing to a “you” who is never clearly named. The result can still be emotionally moving, but the double register begins to collapse: the romantic grammar remains, while the theological anchor fades. Classical hymnody and mature devotional speech show a different pattern. They use intimacy language freely, but they keep it doctrinally bounded by confession, narrative, and moral shape. They remind the singer not only that God loves, but who God is, what God has done, and what kind of life such love forms. This section describes the internal mechanics of that older pattern and then names the failure modes that arise when those mechanics are ignored.

4.1 “Lover language” that remains doctrinally bounded

“Lover language” in Christian hymnody is not primarily erotic; it is relational. It speaks of refuge, embrace, nearness, belonging, consolation, and joy in God. The key difference between healthy hymn intimacy and unhealthy romanticization is anchoring. Anchoring happens in at least four ways.

First, the beloved is named. Hymns that use intimate language typically tether it to explicit address: Christ, Jesus, Lord, Savior, Redeemer. This naming matters more than modern writers often realize. It prevents the lyric from functioning as a blank check for projection. It also keeps the congregation inside a shared confession rather than a private romantic script. When a hymn says “Jesus,” the lyric’s “you” becomes historically and theologically constrained.

Second, the intimacy is tied to salvation narrative rather than mood. The nearness of God is not portrayed as merely a comforting feeling; it is grounded in what God has done: incarnation, cross, resurrection, mercy, forgiveness, deliverance, sanctification. In that structure, intimacy is not an end in itself. It is the relational fruit of divine action. The singer is not pursuing a feeling; the singer is responding to grace.

Third, the moral shape is covenantal. Healthy hymns do not merely say “hold me” in a way that implies passive dependency without transformation. They weave intimacy together with repentance, obedience, surrender, and holiness. The singer is held, but also changed. The beloved is tender, but also Lord. This fusion is essential. It guards intimacy from becoming mere spiritual indulgence. It also guards doctrine from becoming cold. Love and lordship are not rivals; they interpret each other.

Fourth, the intimacy is often framed as refuge and rescue rather than romance. This is a more biblical than modern people sometimes assume. The grammar can sound like human attachment, but the semantic center is safety: God as shelter, God as keeper, God as sustaining

presence. In this frame, “lover language” functions as an intensified way to express trust. It is closer to “I will not let you go because you are my life” than to “I am infatuated with you.”

A mature church can therefore use intimate hymnody without drifting into confusion if it chooses songs that preserve these anchors: explicit naming, narrative grounding, covenantal moral shape, and refuge semantics. The point is not to purge intimacy, but to tether it.

4.2 Desire transposed: longing as sanctified energy

The double register is powerful because it acknowledges something churches sometimes treat as suspect: desire is central to human life. People do not merely think; they want. They are drawn, repelled, hungry, restless, captivated. Christian formation, at its best, does not aim to eliminate desire. It aims to purify and reorder desire.

Hymnody becomes a primary instrument of this reordering because it gives desire a new object and a new discipline. The language of longing is not denied; it is transposed. “Transpose” is the right metaphor because it suggests continuity and transformation at once. The same human capacity that longs for created intimacy is redirected toward the Creator, not by rejecting the capacity, but by elevating its aim and cleansing its distortions.

In this transposition, longing becomes sanctified energy. It becomes a motive force for prayer, endurance, holiness, and hope. The singer learns to interpret yearning as a spiritual signal rather than as a shameful weakness. This is crucial for pastoral care. When believers cannot interpret longing rightly, they often manage it poorly: through distraction, pornography, romantic entanglement, substances, cynicism, or secret shame. When believers learn to bring longing into worship, longing becomes less dangerous because it becomes less clandestine. It is brought into the light and given a truthful name.

But transposition is not the same as indulgence. The tradition consistently distinguishes between desire that seeks God and desire that seeks a feeling about God. In other words, longing is sanctified when it becomes a stable orientation toward God’s reality and will, not when it becomes a craving for emotional highs. Healthy hymnody can help make this distinction by pairing longing language with surrender language: “not my way, but yours,” “teach me,” “hold me,” “make me faithful,” “keep me steady.” The singer is not primarily chasing sensation; the singer is consenting to being formed.

This is also where the double register provides realism. Many believers have seasons of dryness and distraction. A hymn that includes drift language, fear language, and plea language allows the singer to remain faithful without pretending. It teaches that longing itself can be prayer, and that the absence of felt sweetness is not proof of abandonment. Longing becomes a way of staying in the relationship when the line is hard to hold.

4.3 Congregational pedagogy: how repeated singing forms a soul

Hymnody is not merely expression; it is pedagogy. It forms the soul by repetition in community. This matters because people do not become spiritually mature mainly through occasional insights. They become mature through patterned practice that retrains attention, desire, and interpretation over time.

Repeated singing forms a soul in several concrete ways.

First, it trains memory. A sung line is easier to recall than a spoken paragraph. This is why hymns often surface in hospitals, funerals, and moments of fear when sermons are forgotten. The words return because the melody carried them. When a hymn is theologically and emotionally sound, it becomes a portable resource for the believer's inner life.

Second, it trains shared language. Congregational singing gives a community a common vocabulary for confession, lament, gratitude, and hope. This is socially and spiritually significant. Without shared vocabulary, people interpret their interior lives in isolation, and isolation breeds distortion. Shared hymn language allows believers to recognize that their fear or dryness is not unique, that the saints have walked this path before, and that there are truthful ways to speak about it.

Third, it trains affect regulation. This is not manipulation when done honestly; it is formation. Humans are shaped by rhythm and breath. Singing slows breathing, synchronizes a room, and stabilizes attention. A congregation singing a steady hymn is, physiologically and socially, practicing steadiness. In an anxious culture, this is not trivial. It teaches the nervous system that worship is not only a stimulus event but a place of ordered attention.

Fourth, it trains theological instincts. Hymns embed doctrine into emotion. Over time, the believer's "automatic interpretations" can become more Christian. When fear rises, the words "refuge," "mercy," "faithful," "steadfast," "deliver" may come more readily to mind than the words of panic. When shame rises, confession language may be more available than hiding. This is what it means for worship to be formative: it changes the default inner script.

Finally, it trains humility through corporate voice. Singing together is a subtle discipline against the cult of the self. The singer must match tempo, key, and shared words. The self is not the center; the shared confession is. This is one reason the double register is safer in congregational hymnody than in isolated private devotion. The community provides boundaries. The "you" is confessed together; it is not a private fantasy object.

4.4 Failure modes: sentimentality, manipulation, and the collapse into performance

Because hymnody is powerful, it is also vulnerable. The same mechanisms that form a soul can deform it if misused. Three failure modes are especially relevant to the double register.

The first failure mode is sentimentality. Sentimentality is not the presence of feeling; it is the substitution of feeling for truth. A sentimental worship culture may use intimate language but avoid the hard edges of the gospel: repentance, the cross, suffering, holiness, patience, obedience, judgment, moral transformation. The songs become warm but weightless. The "relationship" becomes a comfort narrative untested by reality. Over time, this produces believers who are emotionally attached to worship experiences but less capable of endurance, confession, or costly love. The double register collapses because the secondary register dominates: romance grammar remains, while covenantal moral shape disappears.

The second failure mode is manipulation. This occurs when music is used to engineer an emotional state and then that state is treated as spiritual proof or as leverage for compliance. Manipulation can be subtle: extended crescendos, repeated phrases designed to induce trance, public pressure to demonstrate response, leaders interpreting tears as "God is moving" in a way that discourages honest dissent or complexity. None of this requires bad intent, but the effect can be corrosive. It teaches believers to distrust their own discernment and to equate intensity with authenticity. In this environment, the double register becomes dangerous because romantic and embodied language can be used to bypass critical faculties and boundaries.

The third failure mode is the collapse into performance. When worship becomes a show, intimacy language becomes theatrical. The singer becomes a spectator. The stage becomes the center. The "you" may still be God in theory, but in practice the emotional focus is on the performance itself: the vocalist's expression, the band's dynamics, the room's vibe. The result is a spirituality of consumption. People "attend" worship the way they attend entertainment, and the double register becomes another aesthetic effect rather than an avenue of communion.

These failure modes do not imply that modern worship is inherently corrupt or that classical hymnody is automatically safe. They imply that the church must treat worship language as a formation technology that requires ethics. The question is not whether intimacy language should be used, but whether it is bounded by confession, shaped by covenant, tested by fruit, and oriented toward Christ rather than toward sensation.

The constructive implication is clear. If churches recover hymnody and devotional speech that are intimate yet doctrinally anchored, they can close the pastoral gap described earlier. They can give believers a mature language for longing and drift without turning longing into a god. They can teach that divine intimacy is real, not because the room feels electric, but because Christ is faithful and the Spirit forms steady love over time. When that happens, hymnody becomes what it has often been at its best: the Church learning to speak to God with a human voice that is neither ashamed of desire nor enslaved to it.

5. The Mystics: Union Without Illusion

If hymnody gives a congregation a shared language for intimacy, the mystics explore intimacy at depth, often under conditions where ordinary language breaks down. They are not a separate religion within Christianity; at their best, they are extreme witnesses to what ordinary Christianity already claims: that God is not merely believed but known, not merely obeyed but loved, not merely described but encountered. The mystics therefore become a crucial test case for the double register. They use intimacy language intensely, sometimes with bodily imagery that modern readers find unsettling, yet they also insist with equal intensity that God is not a feeling, not an image, not an inner movie, and not a tool for self-affirmation. The mystic's claim is not "I learned how to generate spiritual fireworks." The claim is closer to: "God is real, and when God draws near, the self is exposed, purified, and reordered." Their most reliable contribution to the present problem is this: union can be spoken of without illusion, and intimacy can be pursued without collapsing into romance or sensation.

This section focuses on four elements that make the mystics useful rather than dangerous for contemporary churches. First, it explains why mystics speak in paradox and metaphor: not because they are trying to be obscure, but because their subject matter outruns literal categories. Second, it shows that authentic mystical union is inseparable from purification, truthfulness, and the discipline of the cross. Third, it distinguishes three realities that modern believers often confuse: consolation, ecstasy, and holiness. Finally, it provides formation rules for reading mystics safely, so that ordinary believers can benefit from their wisdom without turning mystical language into a pressure to perform or an excuse for error.

5.1 Why mystics speak in paradox and metaphor

Mystics speak in paradox because they are describing a relation between realities that are not commensurate: finite creature and infinite God. Literal language works well for many aspects of faith: confession, moral instruction, narrative memory, doctrinal boundaries. But when the subject becomes "union with God," the limits of literal categories are exposed. If a mystic says, "God is near," the reader may imagine spatial nearness, which is inadequate. If a mystic says, "God is within," the reader may imagine a psychological state, which is also inadequate. If a mystic says, "I know God," the reader may imagine ordinary knowledge of an object, which again fails. Mystical speech therefore tends to oscillate, not because it is unstable, but because it is attempting to prevent the reader from freezing God into an idol.

Paradox is the mystic's way of protecting transcendence while affirming intimacy. God is "hidden" and "present." God is "beyond" and "within." God is "unknowable" and yet "known." God is "silent" and yet "speaks." These are not rhetorical tricks; they are guardrails against reduction. They are also an admission that spiritual life includes genuine experiences that do

not fit neat boxes: sudden clarity that cannot be explained, peace that does not follow circumstances, grief that becomes prayer, dryness that is not failure, love that feels like both wound and healing.

Metaphor is equally necessary because human cognition runs on analogy. The mystic reaches for what is most vivid in ordinary life to hint at what cannot be directly represented. This is where the double register becomes intense. Lovers, hunger, thirst, burning, light, darkness, journey, home, wound, sweetness, breath, river, fire: these images are not meant to be taken as literal descriptions of divine mechanics. They are vehicles for reverent approximation. The reader who demands literalism will misunderstand, either by dismissing the language as nonsense or by turning the metaphor into a technique. The tradition's best guidance is to treat mystical metaphor as icon rather than instrument: it points, it invites, it provokes reverence, but it does not hand you a lever.

Finally, mystics often speak as if they are describing interior phenomena because the primary "arena" of divine communion, for most people, is the interior life: attention, intention, conscience, desire. But interior does not mean imaginary. The mystic is not claiming "I made this up inside my head." The mystic is claiming "I was acted upon, addressed, corrected, and drawn." This claim must remain open to testing and discernment, but it should not be dismissed simply because the language is inward. The Christian tradition has always held that God addresses persons inwardly as well as outwardly, and that the inner life is a moral and spiritual battleground where truth can be received or resisted.

5.2 Purification and truth: union language under the discipline of the cross

The surest way to distinguish authentic mystical Christianity from spiritual romanticism is the cross. The mystics who remain within the Christian inheritance consistently teach that union with God is not a shortcut around purification. In fact, intimacy increases the demand for truthfulness. Nearness to God exposes the self. It reveals attachments, fantasies, hidden pride, unresolved resentments, and self-deceptions. The mystic's path is therefore often described as a path of stripping: false consolations removed, self-reliance confronted, spiritual vanity dismantled, and the will trained to consent to God rather than to its own preferred image of God.

This is why mystical union, when genuine, tends to produce sobriety rather than flamboyance. It does not make a person eager to announce experiences; it often makes a person more cautious, more humble, more restrained. The mystic learns that extraordinary experiences can be spiritually dangerous because they can become fuel for pride. The cross functions as a discipline against this danger. It insists that love is proved by obedience and charity, not by intensity. It

insists that holiness is measured by fruit, not by visions. It insists that God is not at the mercy of the seeker's technique.

Purification also protects the double register from erotic drift. When intimate metaphors are placed under the cross, they lose their capacity to become indulgent. The mystic may speak of desire, but desire is being purified, not indulged. The mystic may speak of sweetness, but sweetness is not pursued as an end; it comes and goes. The mystic may speak of union, but union is not possession; it is surrender. In this sense, mystical intimacy is not about getting an experience. It is about becoming the kind of person who can bear truth and love without turning either into self-worship.

This is also where churches can learn something crucial for contemporary formation. Many modern believers live in a therapeutic culture that treats comfort as a primary good. Mystical Christianity does not despise comfort, but it refuses to make comfort the measure of divine presence. The cross teaches that God can be present in darkness, dryness, and suffering. Union language, therefore, is not a promise of constant sweetness; it is a promise of faithful presence that can sustain a person through purification. The mystic's "dark night" is not a marketing slogan. It is a claim that spiritual maturation includes seasons where God feels absent, not as punishment, but as a way of cleansing the soul of dependence on felt support.

5.3 Distinguishing consolation, ecstasy, and holiness

Modern readers often collapse three distinct realities into one: consolation, ecstasy, and holiness. The mystics help disentangle them.

Consolation is a gift of comfort, peace, sweetness, or clarity that strengthens a person in faith and love. It can be gentle or intense. It can arise in prayer, worship, Scripture reading, or ordinary life. Consolation is not bad. It is often mercy. But it is not a reliable indicator of maturity. New believers can receive consolation, and mature believers can experience its absence. Consolation is a help, not a trophy.

Ecstasy is a more extreme form of affective and sometimes bodily experience. It may involve overwhelming joy, tears, altered sense of time, heightened perception, or a sense of being "carried." Ecstasy can occur in genuine spiritual contexts, but it is the most ambiguous category because it can also be produced by natural causes: psychology, nervous system patterns, group dynamics, music, trauma release, or even manipulation. The mystics tend to treat ecstasy with caution for precisely this reason. Ecstasy is not automatically holy, and the desire for ecstasy can become a spiritual addiction. A church that confuses ecstasy with God will train believers to chase states, not to love God.

Holiness is different. Holiness is the long obedience of love: humility, patience, chastity, generosity, truth-telling, forgiveness, courage, steadiness, service. Holiness is testable in

community. Holiness is measurable by fruit over time. Holiness is compatible with consolation and compatible with dryness. Holiness is compatible with occasional ecstasy and compatible with a life that never experiences ecstasy. This is why the fruit test is so central. Mystical language can only be safely received when it is subordinated to holiness as the true measure of spiritual maturity.

When churches recover this triad, they can use mystical resources without destabilizing believers. They can teach that consolation is welcome but not demanded, that ecstasy is not proof, and that holiness is the aim. They can also remove shame from ordinary believers who do not have dramatic experiences. The mystics themselves, at their best, are allies here: many warn against craving experiences and emphasize that God's will and love are the reliable path, not extraordinary states.

5.4 Reading mystics safely: formation rules for ordinary believers

Mystical texts can be spiritually nourishing, but they can also be misread in predictable ways, especially by modern readers trained either in literalism or in self-help consumption. The goal is not to gatekeep mystics as if they are dangerous contraband. The goal is to read them with formation rules that preserve their gifts and reduce their risks.

First, read mystics within the whole Christian frame. Mystical writing is not a replacement for Scripture, community, worship, and moral discipleship. It is a commentary on deepened prayer and love. If a reader uses mystics to bypass ordinary obedience or to justify private spirituality detached from community, the reading has already gone wrong.

Second, refuse technique obsession. Mystics often describe practices, but their central emphasis is usually surrender, humility, and truth. If a reader extracts a method as if it were a guaranteed procedure for producing experiences, the reader has converted metaphor into instrument and turned God into a mechanism. A safe reader treats practices as aids to attention and consent, not as levers that compel God.

Third, interpret intense metaphors as signs, not instructions. When a mystic speaks of wounds, burning, intoxication, or bridal union, the reader should ask: what aspect of spiritual reality is being pointed to, and what moral fruit is being demanded? The answer is typically some form of purified love, not a chase for sensation.

Fourth, keep the fruit test central and long-horizon. A mystic's credibility is not proved by intensity of language but by the moral and communal fruit of the life described. For ordinary believers, the question is not "Can I replicate this?" The question is "Does this increase humility, love of neighbor, patience, repentance, courage, steadiness, and worship of God rather than self?" If not, set it aside.

Fifth, read slowly and selectively. Mystical works are not meant to be binge-consumed. They are more like spiritual exercises than like information. A few paragraphs, read prayerfully and tested in life, can be more beneficial than a whole book skimmed. This slow reading also reduces the risk of misunderstanding metaphors as claims of literal spiritual physics.

Sixth, use community and counsel. Private interpretation is the danger zone for any intense spiritual material. A church that wants to recover mystical resources safely should create contexts where people can discuss them with mature guidance. This is especially important for believers with trauma histories or scrupulosity, who may interpret mystical demands as condemnation rather than invitation.

Seventh, preserve permission for ordinariness. Most believers will not have dramatic mystical experiences, and they do not need them. The mystics can be read as witnesses to the depth of God, not as a job description for every Christian. A healthy church can say: your steady love, your daily prayer, your service, your repentance, your endurance are not second-class. They are the normal form of union: not spectacular, but real.

If churches adopt these formation rules, the mystics become less of a threat and more of a resource. They help restore the church's language for intimacy without collapsing into romantic confusion. They show that the double register can be used with great intensity while remaining morally sober and doctrinally anchored. Above all, they teach the central lesson needed for the present moment: union is real, but illusion is easy; therefore, intimacy must be paired with humility, purification, and fruit-tested truth.

6. Eastern and Western Patterns: Two Ways of Guarding Intimacy

The Christian tradition does not offer only one way to speak about intimacy with God. It offers a family of ways, and two broad patterns stand out historically: an Eastern emphasis on participation and theosis, and a Western emphasis on affect, imagery, and the language of desire. These are not absolute categories, and there is overlap in both directions. But as tendencies, they represent two different strategies for guarding divine intimacy from the same twin dangers we have been tracking: sterility on one side and sentimental or erotic confusion on the other.

The East often guards intimacy by conceptual precision about union: participation without fusion, communion without collapse, transformation by grace without loss of creaturely identity. It emphasizes the life of God shared, the image being restored, the human being "made by grace what God is by nature," while remaining adamant that God is not an object of our possession. The West often guards intimacy by moral and cruciform discipline while allowing language and imagery to remain vivid: love as wound, longing as prayer, union as a felt

transformation that reaches the whole person, including the body. In both cases, the goal is the same: real communion with God. The difference lies in the primary guardrail. The East tends to guard with metaphysical grammar; the West tends to guard with affective realism placed under the cross.

Contemporary churches often inherit fragments of these traditions without the full logic that makes them safe. Some inherit Western intimacy language without Western ascetical discipline, producing sentimentality. Others inherit a minimalist "Bible-only" posture that inadvertently approximates Eastern apophatic restraint but without Eastern participatory richness, producing sterility. The constructive opportunity is to recover the strengths of both patterns in a synthesis that is formation-friendly: intimacy that is emotionally honest, doctrinally bounded, and resistant to erotic drift.

6.1 Theosis and participation: intimacy without eroticization

Theosis, in its classic Christian sense, refers to participation in the life of God by grace. It does not mean that humans become God by nature. It means that humans are transformed, healed, and made radiant with divine life while remaining fully human. This participatory framing has a particular advantage for our theme: it provides a robust account of union that does not require romantic metaphor to carry the weight.

Participation language is intimate without being erotic. It can speak of "communion," "indwelling," "life," "light," "glory," "healing," "purification," and "likeness." It can speak of transformation as real, ontological, and moral without needing to borrow directly from the grammar of lovers. In that sense, it gives churches an option: you can preach union and nearness without triggering romantic scripts in the minds of listeners who may be vulnerable, traumatized, or simply uncomfortable with spousal imagery.

This is not because Eastern Christianity lacks warmth. It is often deeply tender, but its tenderness is frequently mediated through the language of healing, mercy, and light rather than through romantic longing. The approach also tends to emphasize reverence and mystery. God is encountered, but God is not domesticated. God is not made psychologically manageable by being cast as a lover. God remains God. The believer is drawn toward God through worship, prayer, repentance, and sacramental life, but the interiority is guarded by a strong sense that God exceeds all images.

This pattern therefore guards intimacy by refusing to let the imagination become the primary engine. The believer is not asked to imagine romantic closeness; the believer is invited into participation through practices that train attention, humility, and presence. Union is treated as a deepening of communion over time, not as a peak experience. In contemporary terms, this is a powerful antidote to the culture of spiritual intensity chasing. It tells believers: you do not need

fireworks to be united to God; you need faithfulness, humility, and a life oriented toward communion.

At the same time, participation language can feel abstract to some modern believers, especially those formed primarily by therapeutic or relational vocabulary. Theosis can sound like a metaphysical concept rather than a lived relationship. This is not a flaw in theosis; it is a translation challenge. The participatory model needs pastoral rendering: it must be connected to lived realities of fear, drift, longing, and rescue. Otherwise, it can drift toward a kind of cool spiritual geometry that does not touch the heart. That is where the Western tradition's affective realism can help.

6.2 Western affect and imagery: intimacy through embodied metaphor

The Western pattern is often more willing to speak of God in the language of desire, longing, and intimate attachment, sometimes using bridal or lover metaphors in ways that can feel shocking to modern sensibilities. But the best Western tradition does not do this to eroticize faith. It does it to tell the truth about the human heart.

The Western language is psychologically direct. It names the interior battles: restlessness, fear, shame, craving, distraction, dryness, longing. It treats these not as irrelevant noise but as the material of sanctification. In this pattern, intimacy with God is not merely a metaphysical participation; it is a lived attachment. It is not merely "you are transformed"; it is "you are held," "you are pursued," "you are taught," "you are rescued," "you are loved."

Embodied metaphor becomes essential here. Humans do not experience love as an equation. They experience love as shelter, embrace, hunger, thirst, homecoming, and fidelity under strain. Western devotional language uses these metaphors to train the believer's desire. It says: yes, you long; yes, you ache; yes, you drift; bring that into the presence of God, not to indulge it, but to have it purified and reordered. This is the double register at full strength: the romantic grammar is present, but it is pressed into service of covenantal truth.

The Western pattern also tends to guard intimacy by insisting on purification. The cross remains central. Desire is not treated as a reliable compass; it is treated as a force that must be disciplined and transformed. The Western mystics, at their best, are unsparing about self-deception. They warn that sweetness can mislead, that visions can inflate ego, that fervor can mask pride. So even though Western language can sound emotionally intense, it is often spiritually austere. It allows intimacy language precisely because it does not trust intimacy language to sanctify itself. It puts the whole interior life under discernment.

In contemporary churches, the Western style is often inherited in a distorted form: intense language without ascetical discipline, romance grammar without doctrinal anchoring, tenderness without the cross. That produces the failure modes we have already named:

sentimentality, manipulation, performance. But those failure modes are not inevitable. They reflect a loss of the tradition's internal checks.

6.3 Complementarity: when each tradition corrects the other

The East and West correct each other in predictable ways.

The Eastern participatory pattern corrects Western excess by providing a metaphysical and liturgical guardrail. It says: union is real, but it is participation, not possession. It says: God is personal, but God is not a romantic object. It says: experience matters, but experience is not the measure. It says: reverence is not optional, and mystery is not a failure of articulation but a mark of divine transcendence. For Western churches tempted toward sentimental worship or personality-driven spirituality, this correction is deeply needed.

The Western affective pattern corrects Eastern risks by insisting that participation must be lived in the heart, not merely affirmed in concept. It says: if you cannot name fear, longing, drift, and rescue, your theology may remain correct but pastorally mute. It says: the human person is not healed by metaphysical grammar alone; the will and desire must be engaged. It says: communion is not merely a doctrine; it is a relationship that is felt, tested, and enacted. For communities tempted toward cool abstraction or a reverence that becomes emotional avoidance, this correction is equally needed.

This complementarity suggests a simple diagnostic. If your church is prone to spectacle, anxiety about feelings, and "vibe-driven" certainty, you need Eastern guardrails: reverence, participation language, apophatic restraint, and a stronger doctrine of union that is not romanticized. If your church is prone to dryness, intellectualization, and fear of interiority, you need Western resources: a richer vocabulary of longing, a more honest account of desire, and a devotional language that can speak to human experience without embarrassment.

Most contemporary churches need both. And many believers already carry both needs within themselves: they want intimacy, and they fear illusion; they want warmth, and they fear manipulation; they want truth, and they fear sterility.

6.4 A synthesis option for contemporary churches

A practical synthesis is possible, and it does not require importing unfamiliar ritual forms or abandoning one's tradition. It requires recovering a balanced set of emphases and teaching believers how to interpret them.

The synthesis can be summarized as follows. Use Eastern participatory grammar to define union, and use Western affective grammar to voice longing, while subjecting both to the same discernment framework: reverence plus audit, fruit-tested over time, cruciform in shape, and anchored explicitly to Christ.

Concretely, this means four moves.

First, teach union primarily as participation rather than as romance. This gives the congregation a stable metaphysical frame: communion is real, grace is transformative, God is not possessed, and the goal is likeness to Christ. This also provides safety for those who are wary of intimacy language.

Second, allow intimate devotional language as secondary register, but keep it explicitly anchored. Name Christ. Ground the language in salvation narrative. Pair longing with surrender. Pair tenderness with holiness. Use hymns and prayers that can say "hold me" and "keep me" without becoming vague or eroticized.

Third, normalize non-spectacular spirituality. In the synthesis, the "normal" life is abiding, prayer, repentance, sacrament, service, and community. Consolations may come; ecstasies may or may not. Neither is the measure. The measure is fruit: humility, charity, patience, courage, truthfulness, steadiness.

Fourth, create communal interpretive guidance. The double register is safe when it is taught. A church can explain, without embarrassment, why biblical and historical Christianity uses spousal and longing metaphors, and also explain what those metaphors do not mean. It can teach discernment explicitly: how to distinguish awe from arousal, consolation from holiness, intimacy from indulgence, and spiritual warmth from manipulation.

This synthesis does not flatten difference; it uses difference as mutual protection. It gives the church a way to recover expressive depth without opening the door to confusion. It lets the arts and the tradition become allies again. The result is a form of Christian speech that can be intimate without being childish, reverent without being numb, emotionally honest without being led by emotion, and spiritually daring without being spiritually reckless.

In other words, it recovers what many believers are reaching for when they say, "The artists are ahead of our churches." They are not asking for the church to become an art gallery. They are asking for the church to regain a language capable of God: a language that can hold real longing, real rescue, real union, and real reverence in the same breath.

7. A Discernment Framework: Reverence Plus Audit

The double register is powerful because it speaks to the whole human: mind, heart, imagination, and body. That same power makes it vulnerable. The church's hesitation is not irrational. Intimacy language can be misread, misused, or weaponized. A culture trained to monetize arousal and outrage can pull sacred speech toward scandal. A worship environment can drift into manipulation without intending to. An individual can mistake intensity for truth

because intensity is persuasive. For all these reasons, recovering the double register responsibly requires more than taste. It requires discernment that is both reverent and auditable.

“Reverence plus audit” names a posture and a method. Reverence means we treat God as God: not our possession, not our projection, not our emotional product. Audit means we examine what a practice, a lyric, an image, or an experience is doing in us and among us, over time, with testable outcomes. Audit is not cynicism; it is stewardship. It asks: what is this forming? What does it reward? What does it hide? What does it tempt? What does it produce in character, community, and truthfulness?

This framework is designed to be usable. It can be applied to hymns, worship sets, sermons, devotional books, sacred art, mystical language, and even personal spiritual experiences. It does not pretend to deliver perfect certainty. It does aim to prevent predictable failures: vagueness that collapses God into a generic beloved, metaphor that becomes an end in itself, affect that becomes spiritual proof, and “union talk” that bypasses the cross.

The framework has five tests. They are not five separate bureaucratic hurdles; they are five angles on the same question: is this intimacy with God, or is this intimacy with a substitute?

7.1 The primary-register test: is God named and centered explicitly

The first test is simple: is God, in a specifically Christian sense, named and centered? The double register is safe only when the primary register remains primary. When the primary register fades, the secondary register dominates, and the whole phenomenon becomes unstable.

Practically, this means that intimate language must be anchored to clear confession. In worship, the “you” should not remain indefinitely vague. A congregation can sing “you are beautiful,” “hold me,” “stay with me,” and “I need you,” but if God is never named, Christ is never confessed, and the story of salvation is never invoked, the lyric becomes a projection surface. People will pour into the “you” whatever beloved they already carry: a romantic partner, a lost parent, an idealized self, an imagined cosmic force. The song may still produce tears, but those tears will not necessarily be worship. They may be grief, nostalgia, or longing for a human object. None of that is evil, but it is not the same thing as centering God.

The primary-register test therefore asks concrete questions:

Does the language clearly identify God, Christ, Lord, Savior, Father, Spirit, or another explicit theological anchor?
Does the content situate intimacy within the Christian narrative of grace, mercy, forgiveness, deliverance, sanctification, and hope?
Does the lyric or practice preserve God’s otherness and holiness even while it affirms nearness?

When the answer is yes, intimacy language becomes less ambiguous. The worshiper is being invited toward God, not toward an emotional surrogate.

This test also applies outside music. In devotional writing, does "the Beloved" remain undefined, or is the beloved explicitly the God of Scripture? In sacred art, does the iconography or narrative context anchor the work in Christian confession, or is it merely spiritual mood? In mystical testimony, is the content consistent with a God who calls for truth and love, or does it drift toward private gnosis detached from Christ?

The goal is not to police every poetic line. The goal is to keep the center of gravity correct. When the primary register is explicit, the secondary register can do its work as metaphor without taking over.

7.2 The secondary-register test: metaphor as bridge, not destination

The second test addresses a common confusion: metaphor can become addictive. The secondary register is vivid, and vividness is persuasive. People can start to pursue the feeling of the metaphor rather than the reality the metaphor points toward. When that happens, worship shifts from communion to aesthetic consumption.

The secondary-register test asks: is the romantic or embodied metaphor functioning as a bridge toward God's reality and God's will, or is it becoming the destination itself?

A bridge has at least three features.

First, it points beyond itself. The metaphor should lead the worshiper toward trust, surrender, repentance, gratitude, obedience, and love of neighbor. If the metaphor creates a closed loop of self-soothing or emotional stimulation without moral or relational consequence, it is no longer a bridge; it is a cul-de-sac.

Second, it remains proportionate. The tradition's healthiest use of intimate metaphors is balanced by other metaphors: refuge, shepherd, fatherhood, kingship, light, truth, wisdom, holiness, judge, healer. When one metaphor dominates, it tends to distort. A church that uses only romantic language will eventually romanticize God. A church that uses only kingship language will eventually fear God in a way that undermines intimacy. The bridge is strongest when it is part of an ecosystem of images.

Third, it remains interpretable. Healthy metaphors do not require secrecy. They can be explained in simple terms without embarrassment: "We use longing language because Scripture uses longing language; it is a way of naming the soul's desire for God. We do not mean God is a romantic partner. We mean God is the source of life and love." If leaders cannot explain their metaphors without becoming defensive or evasive, the metaphor is likely functioning as a cover for manipulation or confusion.

This test is especially important for modern worship music and for modern devotional prose, where vague “you” language and romantic tropes can easily become a substitute for theological substance.

7.3 The fruit test: humility, charity, steadiness, obedience

The third test is the most important because it moves from language to life. Scripture’s moral realism insists that true spirituality produces fruit. The fruit test asks: what does this intimacy language actually form in persons and communities over time?

Four fruits are especially diagnostic for our purposes.

Humility. Does the practice produce teachability, confession, and reduced ego? Or does it produce spiritual elitism, performative vulnerability, and superiority based on “experiences”? If intimacy language inflates the self, it is likely a counterfeit intimacy, because real nearness to God tends to reveal creatureliness.

Charity. Does the practice increase love of neighbor in concrete ways: patience, generosity, forgiveness, truth-telling, protection of the vulnerable? Or does it produce inward absorption, worship as private therapy, and indifference to suffering? Intimacy with God that does not spill outward into love is suspect.

Steadiness. Does the practice form endurance through dryness, disappointment, and ordinary time? Or does it train volatility: highs that must be repeated, lows that feel like abandonment, and constant craving for a “move”? A community that confuses intensity with presence will struggle to remain steady. A community trained by mature intimacy can remain faithful even when the feelings are quiet.

Obedience. Does the practice strengthen the will to do what is right when it is costly? Or does it create a loophole spirituality where feeling close to God substitutes for actual discipleship? If intimacy language makes it easier to rationalize sin or avoid responsibility, it is not intimacy with God; it is intimacy with a consoling image.

The fruit test is auditable because it is not private. Communities can observe whether people become more humble, more charitable, more steady, more obedient. Individuals can examine whether they are becoming more truthful and less defensive. This test does not demand perfection. It demands trajectory. Over time, true communion should bend a life toward love.

7.4 The cross test: union language that does not bypass cruciform life

The fourth test is the theological center of gravity: the cross. The double register can be misused to promise union without cost, intimacy without repentance, nearness without transformation. The cross test insists that any claim of union must be compatible with cruciform life.

Cruciform life means at least three things.

First, repentance remains normal. Intimacy with God does not erase sin; it exposes it. If “union talk” makes repentance feel unnecessary or beneath the spiritually mature, it has departed from Christianity.

Second, suffering is not treated as disproof. The cross reveals that God’s love can coexist with pain. Therefore, a spirituality that equates God’s presence with comfort fails the cross test. Union language that cannot include seasons of dryness, grief, and waiting is not robust enough to be Christian.

Third, love becomes costly. The cross is not only about personal salvation; it is also the shape of Christian love: self-giving, forgiveness, refusal of revenge, service to the least, truth under pressure. If intimacy language produces a private paradise but not a cruciform love, it is incomplete at best and counterfeit at worst.

This test does not mean worship must always be somber. The resurrection is real. Joy is real. Consolation is real. The cross test means that joy and consolation are not allowed to become escapism. Union is not an alternative to discipleship; union is what makes discipleship possible.

7.5 The no-oracle rule: resisting intensity as epistemic proof

The fifth test addresses a modern spiritual hazard: using intensity as a source of certainty. People are tempted to treat strong feelings as evidence that something is true, or that a decision is correct, or that God is speaking. This temptation is understandable because intensity is persuasive. It feels like contact. It feels like confirmation. But intensity can arise from many sources, including natural psychology, group dynamics, trauma activation, musical entrainment, suggestion, or simple human yearning.

The no-oracle rule says: intensity is never allowed to function as epistemic proof. It can be welcomed as consolation. It can be honored as meaningful. It can be interpreted as one signal among many. But it cannot be treated as an oracle that overrides discernment, Scripture, counsel, reason, and fruit.

Applied to worship, this means a church must resist the habit of equating tears with truth or goosebumps with divine endorsement. It must resist language that implies “If you feel this, God is here; if you don’t, you are resisting.” Such language trains people into dishonesty and instability. It also creates a culture where manipulation becomes easy.

Applied to personal experiences, the no-oracle rule means: an intense sense of peace is not a guarantee that a decision is wise; it may be avoidance. An intense sense of conviction is not automatically the Spirit; it may be anxiety. An intense sense of love is not automatically God; it may be projection. The audit posture asks: what happens over time if I follow this impulse?

What fruit does it produce? Does it align with truth and love? Does it withstand counsel and reality testing?

This rule is essential for preserving the double register. The double register uses affective and embodied metaphors; therefore it will often evoke affect. The no-oracle rule prevents the affect from seizing authority. It allows the church to say: yes, feel deeply, but do not worship your feelings. Worship God.

When the five tests are used together, the double register becomes far less frightening. Churches can recover intimacy language without becoming sentimental. They can use art and lyric without becoming manipulative. They can welcome mystics without becoming gullible. They can honor consolation without chasing ecstasy. They can remain reverent without becoming sterile.

That is the practical promise of "reverence plus audit." It does not guarantee perfection. It does offer a disciplined pathway back to a language capable of God: intimate, honest, bounded, and fruit-tested in the life of the community.

8. Practical Recommendations for Church Life

If the earlier sections have argued that the double register is a legitimate Christian inheritance, this section answers the question that matters most for congregations: what do we do with it? Many churches sense the problem intuitively. They see believers hungry for depth and honesty, yet wary of manipulation. They want intimacy with God that is real, yet they do not want to create an environment where romantic scripts replace reverence or where vulnerable people are harmed. The solution is not to choose between austerity and emotionalism. The solution is to recover practices that are both warm and bounded, both intimate and auditable.

The recommendations that follow are designed to be implementable at multiple scales: a pastor planning a sermon series, a worship leader shaping a set, a small-group leader guiding discussion, or an elder board reviewing safeguarding practices. Each recommendation assumes the discernment framework already stated: keep the primary register primary, treat metaphor as bridge, measure fruit over time, keep the cross central, and refuse intensity as oracle. The aim is a church culture that can speak about longing without indulging it, and about union without pretending to control it.

8.1 Preaching Song of Songs without embarrassment or gimmickry

Song of Songs is the ideal training ground for the double register because it forces honesty. It is a love poem. If a church refuses that fact, it teaches the congregation to lie about what Scripture contains. If a church leans into the erotic layer with jokes or voyeurism, it teaches the

congregation to cheapen what Scripture honors. A mature approach is neither denial nor titillation. It is reverent realism.

A practical preaching method has five moves.

First, begin with the literal sense and honor it. Say plainly: this is poetry celebrating marital love, desire, and fidelity. It affirms creation and the goodness of embodied love within covenant. Make that explicit, and do it without humor that functions as avoidance. This initial honesty reduces the pressure that often drives either embarrassment or gimmick.

Second, name the canonical context. The Song is not a random erotic interlude; it sits within a biblical world where covenant is frequently described in spousal terms and where love is treated as morally weighty. That context makes theological reading intelligible. It also prevents the sermon from becoming a detached "sex talk" or a detached "allegory talk."

Third, teach the double register explicitly. Tell the congregation: the tradition has read this in two layers, and we can hold both without collapsing either. The literal layer honors human love as a good gift. The theological layer treats human love as a sign that can point beyond itself toward covenant love with God. Explain that "sign" does not mean "replacement." Marriage remains marriage; God remains God. The point is analogy: created love can train us in fidelity, desire, and delight that ultimately find their truest object in God.

Fourth, apply the text pastorally rather than voyeuristically. The Song includes themes that are highly usable without prying: longing, seeking, absence, reunion, praise that builds up rather than consumes, boundaries, mutuality, and patience. These themes can be preached with dignity. The goal is not to enumerate sexual details; the goal is to form a community whose language about love is truthful, covenantal, and unashamed.

Fifth, connect the Song's desire language to spiritual formation. Many believers experience desire as either shameful or dangerous. The Song, handled well, teaches that desire is powerful and therefore must be disciplined, not erased. It becomes an invitation to bring longing into God's presence and to let desire be reordered rather than suppressed. This is one of the most healing pastoral moves available, especially for people trapped between puritan shame and permissive indulgence.

The overarching rule is simple: preach the Song as Scripture, not as novelty. If a sermon series on Song of Songs feels like a special event, it will likely attract either anxiety or spectacle. If it is treated as normal Scripture, the congregation learns that the Bible can speak honestly without being crude and can be intimate without being eroticized.

8.2 Worship design: cultivating depth without erotic drift

Worship design is not only about choosing songs; it is about shaping an environment where intimacy with God is both possible and safe. The double register can enrich worship, but it can also drift if the primary register is weak or if the room is trained to treat intensity as proof.

A practical worship design strategy includes six elements.

First, strengthen naming and confession. Choose songs that explicitly name God and Christ regularly. If a set includes several "you" songs, anchor them with songs that confess the gospel narrative: mercy, cross, resurrection, holiness, hope. The aim is not to remove poetic address but to keep the primary register unmistakable.

Second, diversify metaphors. In a given month, ensure that worship language includes refuge, lordship, fatherhood, shepherding, indwelling, gratitude, lament, repentance, and mission. Romantic or longing metaphors can be present, but they should not dominate. Metaphor diversity is a simple safeguard against romanticization.

Third, resist "mood engineering" as the main strategy. Musical build can be beautiful, but when crescendos and repetition are used primarily to produce a state, worship becomes vulnerable to manipulation. A healthier approach is to design sets that support attention and participation, not trance. This can include silence, spoken prayer, confession, Scripture reading, and songs that carry theological weight rather than only atmosphere.

Fourth, make room for lament and repentance. One reason erotic drift happens is that worship becomes uniformly "intimate sweet talk," and the cross disappears. When lament, confession, and sober gratitude are included, intimacy is placed under truth. The congregation learns that closeness to God includes honesty about sin and pain, not only tenderness.

Fifth, reduce performance dominance. This is not an anti-music stance; it is a formation stance. The more worship feels like a concert, the more the congregation becomes a consumer audience. That consumer posture makes the double register less safe because romantic language becomes another aesthetic effect. Anything that increases congregational voice, participatory clarity, and shared confession reduces this risk.

Sixth, explain the language occasionally. A brief pastoral note—once in a while—can do enormous good. "When we sing about longing, we are not turning God into a romantic partner. We are naming the soul's hunger for God. Let this longing become surrender and trust." Such explanation normalizes discernment. It teaches the room how to interpret what it is doing.

The simplest measurable indicator is fruit. If a worship culture produces increasing humility, repentance, steadiness, and love of neighbor, it is likely healthy. If it produces volatility, spiritual

addiction, cliques around “the anointed moments,” or shame in those who do not feel intensity, drift has begun.

8.3 Discipleship practices: attention, confession, community accountability

The double register cannot be sustained by Sunday worship alone. Intimacy language becomes either sentimental or manipulative when the community lacks weekday formation. The church needs simple discipleship practices that train attention, truthfulness, and accountability.

Attention practices matter first because the modern default is distracted drift. If people cannot attend, they cannot pray. A workable church practice is to teach short, repeatable attention disciplines: brief daily silence, slow Scripture reading, short prayers repeated across the day, and deliberate “returning” when the mind wanders. The point is not monastic perfection. The point is training the ability to remain present.

Confession practices matter because intimacy without truthfulness becomes fantasy. Confession need not be theatrical. It can be small-group check-ins, accountability partnerships, or communal liturgical confession. The key is regular honesty that reduces secrecy. When believers learn to say, “I drift,” “I am afraid,” “I am tempted,” “I am numb,” the double register becomes safer because interiority is brought into the light of community rather than being acted out privately.

Community accountability matters because intensity is persuasive. People make decisions based on feelings and then spiritualize the decision. A simple accountability practice is to encourage believers to “run major impulses through counsel” before acting. This is not authoritarianism; it is protection against self-deception. The church can normalize phrases like: “Let’s test this over time,” “What fruit is this producing?” “Does this align with Scripture and love?” “Are you moving toward humility and service or toward self-importance?”

A particularly useful practice is a shared discernment checklist derived from the reverence-plus-audit framework. Not as a legalistic worksheet, but as common language: primary register, metaphor as bridge, fruit over time, cross-shaped life, no-oracle rule. When a church learns these as conversational habits, the double register becomes part of a mature spiritual culture rather than an occasional aesthetic thrill.

8.4 Pastoral safeguards: trauma sensitivity, boundaries, and healthy embodiment

Any church that recovers intimacy language must take safeguarding seriously. Not because intimacy is suspect, but because some people have been wounded in the very places where intimacy language can touch. Trauma history, sexual abuse, coercive spiritual leadership, and relational betrayal can make certain metaphors triggering or confusing. A mature church does not respond by banning intimacy language. It responds by pairing intimacy with safety.

Trauma sensitivity begins with permission. People must feel free to participate without being forced into a particular emotional display. No one should be pressured to raise hands, cry, come forward, or "break through." The no-oracle rule should be culturally explicit: absence of tears is not spiritual failure. Quiet participation is real participation. God is not measured by visible affect.

Boundaries are next. Churches must clearly prohibit and actively prevent any leader from using spiritual intimacy language to create private emotional dependency. This includes overly personal pastoral relationships, secretive counseling dynamics, flirtation framed as "spiritual connection," or any use of authority that blurs lines. Policies matter, but culture matters more: leaders should model restraint, transparency, and accountability. The double register should never become a cloak for predation.

Healthy embodiment is also critical. Some traditions inadvertently teach that the body is either dirty or sovereign. Both extremes are harmful. A church can teach a simple doctrine of embodiment: the body is good, fallen, and redeemable. Feelings are real, but not ultimate. Desire is powerful, but not king. This teaching helps believers interpret bodily and emotional states without shame and without surrendering to them as final guides.

Practical safeguards include: training for leaders on trauma and coercion dynamics, clear reporting pathways, mixed-gender transparency in pastoral care, accountability structures for worship leaders, and a commitment to explain worship language and practices in ways that reduce confusion. None of this needs to be paranoid. It needs to be normal stewardship.

8.5 Re-learning a vocabulary of longing: words that mature desire

One of the most damaging losses in many modern churches is not theological content but vocabulary. When people lack words for interior life, they either go silent or borrow words from whatever culture offers. The church can recover a vocabulary of longing that is both honest and mature.

A mature vocabulary includes at least five categories.

Longing as desire for God, not merely as loneliness. This teaches believers to interpret restlessness as a call toward communion rather than merely as a problem to be medicated or distracted.

Drift as a normal condition of fallen attention, not as proof of hypocrisy. This removes shame and invites practice: returning, abiding, reorienting.

Dryness as a possible season of purification, not necessarily as failure. This stabilizes believers who otherwise panic when feelings fade.

Yearning as consent to be formed, not as craving for sensation. This distinguishes sanctified desire from emotional addiction.

Union as communion and participation, not as fusion or possession. This protects language from both eroticization and pantheistic collapse.

Churches can teach this vocabulary through liturgy, through preaching, through small-group practices, and through curated hymnody. They can also teach believers to pray with these words simply: “Lord, I long for you; purify my longing.” “I drift; help me return.” “I am dry; keep me faithful.” “Make my desire steady and clean.” These are not poetic flourishes; they are formation tools.

When a church re-learns this vocabulary, it becomes less vulnerable to the cultural alternatives: romantic substitutes for God, therapeutic substitutes for repentance, and intensity substitutes for truth. The church becomes capable again of speaking in the full human register without collapsing into human-centeredness. It becomes capable of intimacy without illusion.

These recommendations share a common aim: to make depth normal. Not spectacular. Not embarrassing. Not dangerous. Normal. A church that does this does not need to compete with artists or outsource interior life to private consumption. It becomes what it was meant to be: a community where the human heart can be addressed by God honestly, reverently, and safely—and where longing can mature into love that is steady, cruciform, and real.

9. Objections and Clarifications

A proposal to recover the double register will trigger understandable objections. Some will be moral: “This is flirting with sexualization.” Some will be intellectual: “This is turning theology into feelings.” Some will be doctrinal: “This opens the door to mysticism and error.” Some will be cultural: “This is an old aesthetic that doesn’t translate.” These objections should not be dismissed as reactionary. In many cases, they arise from real harms people have witnessed: manipulative worship cultures, abusive leaders, sentimental theology, or spiritual practices that drift into private revelation untethered from the gospel.

The goal of this section is not to “win” against critics, but to clarify what the model does and does not claim, and to restate the internal guardrails that make recovery possible without naïveté. The core clarification is this: the model is not an argument for more intensity; it is an argument for better language and better discernment. It is not a call to eroticize devotion; it is a call to stop letting the culture own the vocabulary of longing. It is not a call to replace doctrine with affect; it is a call to let doctrine become speakable in the full human register. And it is not a

call to chase experiences; it is a call to test experiences by fruit, by the cross, and by long-horizon formation in community.

9.1 “This makes worship sexual”

This is the most common fear, and it must be answered plainly. The double register can be misused in a way that sexualizes worship. But misuse is not the essence. The model explicitly rejects erotics as method. It treats romantic or embodied language as metaphorical vehicle, a bridge toward truths that cannot be reduced to literal description.

A helpful distinction is between “sexual content” and “relational intensity.” The Bible contains both. It contains celebration of marital love, and it contains intense relational language toward God (longing, thirst, delight, shelter, union). The tradition’s use of romance grammar does not aim to stimulate sexual desire. It aims to name spiritual desire using the most powerful relational grammar humans possess. That is precisely why it needs guardrails.

So the objection is best answered in two parts.

First, clarify intent and meaning. When worship lyrics speak of closeness, holding, longing, or beauty, the intended referent is communion with God: trust, surrender, dependence, delight in divine goodness. The primary register is God-human. If a congregation is taught the double register, it can interpret these lines without erotic drift because it has an interpretive frame: “This is longing transposed, not romance enacted.”

Second, apply the safeguards. The model includes explicit protections: keep God named and centered (primary-register test), treat metaphor as bridge (secondary-register test), keep the cross central (cross test), test by fruit (fruit test), and refuse intensity as proof (no-oracle rule). In practice, this means selecting worship language that is doctrinally anchored, avoiding sets dominated by vague romantic tropes, explaining the metaphors occasionally, and refusing any worship culture that pressures believers into performative affect.

It is also important to say this: in many contexts the real danger is not that worship becomes sexual, but that believers, lacking a mature vocabulary for longing, outsource longing to sexual substitutes. When the church cannot speak about desire and attachment with reverent realism, believers do not become desire-free. They become desire-unmentored. A mature recovery of the double register can actually reduce sexualization by bringing desire under truth, discipline, and community.

9.2 “This reduces theology to psychology”

This objection comes in two forms. One form says: “You’re making faith about feelings.” The other says: “You’re treating God as a psychological projection.” The model does neither.

The model presupposes that theology is about God and that doctrine matters. The proposal is about language and formation, not about replacing truth with affect. In fact, the primary-register test exists precisely to prevent psychology from becoming the center. God must be named and confessed. The salvation narrative must anchor the language. Without this, the "you" becomes a projection surface, and the objection becomes valid. The model's first move is therefore anti-projection: do not let poetic address float free of confession.

At the same time, the model refuses a false alternative: either doctrine or interiority. Humans always experience doctrine through psychological and embodied channels. When a church pretends that it can teach truth without shaping the imagination, emotions, and habits of attention, it does not escape psychology; it simply leaves psychology unformed. The result is often a congregation whose doctrinal statements are correct while their actual lived motivations are driven by fear, shame, desire for approval, or resentment.

So the model claims something modest and necessary: interiority is part of discipleship. Psychology is not the source of theology, but it is one of the primary arenas where theology is received, resisted, distorted, or embodied. The question is not "Will psychology be involved?" The question is "Will psychology be submitted to truth and tested by fruit?"

The fruit test and cross test are decisive here. If intimacy language produces humility, charity, steadiness, and obedience, then theology is not being reduced to psychology; theology is being embodied. If intimacy language produces self-absorption, volatility, and performance, then psychology has taken over and the church must correct course.

9.3 "This invites mysticism and error"

This objection is especially common in communities that have seen charismatic excess or who fear private revelation and spiritual elitism. The fear is legitimate: mystical language can be used to claim authority, bypass accountability, or introduce novel teachings under the banner of "God told me."

The model's response is again twofold.

First, clarify what "mysticism" means in this paper. We are not advocating a separate stream of knowledge that overrides Scripture or doctrine. We are naming a dimension of Christian life that has always existed: prayerful communion with God, deepened love, and interior transformation. The mystics are presented as witnesses to union under discipline, not as oracles who create new doctrine.

Second, enforce interpretive boundaries. The model's no-oracle rule directly targets the common pathway to error: treating experiences as epistemic proof. Experiences may occur. They may be meaningful. They may console or convict. But they do not automatically authorize

beliefs or decisions. They must be tested: by Scripture, by community counsel, by humility, by fruit over time, and by cruciform life.

This is why the paper emphasizes “union without illusion.” The mystics most useful for the church are precisely those who warn against spiritual vanity and who subordinate extraordinary experiences to obedience and love. If a reader or a leader uses mystical language to escape accountability, they have violated the model at its core.

So yes: any recovery of depth and intimacy increases the need for discernment. But the alternative is not safety; it is shallowness or secrecy. A church that refuses all mystical language may still produce mystical hunger; it will just be pursued privately, without guidance, and therefore with higher risk of error. The model argues for supervised depth rather than unsupervised depth.

9.4 “This is culturally dated”

Some will say: “This bridal and longing language is medieval or Baroque. It doesn’t fit modern life. It will alienate people.” There is truth here, but it can be overstated.

It is true that cultures differ in their default metaphors. Some metaphors land differently in different contexts. Certain phrases may sound foreign or overly ornate in contemporary English. Churches should not force archaic idioms as a badge of seriousness.

But the human realities behind the metaphors are not dated. Longing, fear, drift, desire for refuge, joy in being held, grief at absence, hope for reunion—these are permanent human features. Modern people feel them intensely. They simply lack a mature public language to interpret them. That is one reason pop music often becomes the default catechism of desire: it gives words where institutions do not.

The solution is translation, not abandonment. The church can recover the double register in language that is plain, modern, and pastorally safe. It can also use non-romantic biblical metaphors more heavily when needed: adoption, refuge, shepherding, abiding, light, healing, wisdom. The model does not require one aesthetic style. It requires a disciplined relationship between the primary sacred register and the secondary human register.

In that sense, the most “culturally dated” approach may actually be the modern one: pretending that humans can be discipled without robust language for desire. The modern experiment of emotional minimalism has not produced neutral believers; it has produced believers whose longings are trained elsewhere. The church is not being asked to cosplay medieval piety. It is being asked to regain a lost competence: speaking about God in a way that reaches the whole person.

9.5 What can and cannot be claimed by this model

To close, it is important to state the model's claims with precision.

What this model can claim:

It can claim that the double register is present in Scripture and widely in Christian tradition, and therefore it is not inherently illegitimate or "modern corruption."
It can claim that churches often experience a pastoral gap when they rely on thin "relationship" language without a mature vocabulary for interiority.
It can claim that sacred art, hymnody, and mystical writing often preserve a richer vocabulary that can help close that gap.
It can claim that intimacy language can be used safely when bounded by explicit confession, metaphor discipline, fruit testing, cross-shaped realism, and refusal of intensity as oracle.
It can claim that communities can audit outcomes: humility, charity, steadiness, obedience, and healthier handling of desire.

What this model cannot claim:

It cannot claim that particular intense experiences, ecstasies, or artistic interpretations are automatically authentic or divinely sourced. Those require discernment and humility.
It cannot claim that recovering the double register will solve every pastoral problem or prevent every abuse. It reduces risk; it does not eliminate sin.
It cannot claim that a church must adopt a particular aesthetic (Baroque, iconographic, mystical prose) in order to be faithful. The model is about function and discipline, not style.
It cannot claim that metaphor can bear unlimited weight. Metaphor must remain a bridge. When metaphor becomes destination, distortion follows.
It cannot claim that emotional intensity is the measure of God's presence. The no-oracle rule stands: intensity is not proof.

So the proposal is intentionally modest. It is not a new doctrine. It is a recovery of an older competence: a way of speaking and forming that allows the church to be intimate without being erotic, deep without being manipulative, emotionally honest without being led by emotion, and spiritually ambitious without becoming spiritually reckless.

If the church can learn to do that, the complaint "artists are ahead of our churches" will begin to soften. Not because the church has defeated the arts, but because the church has regained its own inheritance: a language capable of God, tested by fruit, and safe for ordinary believers who long for more than slogans.

10. Conclusion: Recovering a Language Capable of God

The argument of this paper has been simple in outline and demanding in implication. The church is not being asked to imitate artists as if art were the new magisterium. The church is being asked to recover its own inheritance: a language for God that is both intimate and reverent, both emotionally honest and doctrinally bounded. When believers say that artists seem "ahead," they are often not praising rebellion; they are naming a pastoral vacuum. Many churches speak of "relationship with God" in a way that is rhetorically familiar but experientially thin. Meanwhile, sacred art, hymnody, and the mystics often preserve a richer grammar—one that can name longing, drift, rescue, union, and desire without collapsing into erotic confusion or psychological self-worship. This paper has called that grammar the double register: primary register God–human / transcendent–immanent, secondary register romantic / human–human by design, used as metaphorical bridge rather than destination.

To recover this language is not to chase intensity. It is to form the whole person. It is to disciple attention and desire in a culture that specializes in scattering attention and exploiting desire. It is to train believers to pray with honesty rather than with slogans. It is to give the church a way to speak of intimacy with God that does not become sentimental, manipulative, or vague. And because every powerful language is vulnerable, the recovery must be paired with a method: reverence plus audit, applied through explicit tests that keep God centered, keep metaphor in its place, measure fruit over time, keep the cross central, and refuse intensity as epistemic proof.

10.1 Restating the thesis: the double register as a formation tool

The thesis can be restated in one sentence: the double register is a Christian inheritance that functions as a formation tool when it is bounded by confession and tested by fruit.

It is an inheritance because Scripture itself uses relational and sometimes spousal imagery to communicate covenant, longing, shelter, and union. The Song of Songs stands as a canonical permission slip for the seriousness and dignity of love poetry, even as the broader canon repeatedly frames God's covenant with the people of God in relational terms. The New Testament deepens the register with abiding, adoption, and bride imagery, insisting that intimacy belongs at the center of Christian life, not at the periphery.

It is a formation tool because it trains what must be trained: attention, desire, and interpretive habits. The church cannot form disciples if it only transmits ideas. It must also shape the inner life—how believers interpret fear, how they handle longing, how they respond to dryness, how they understand consolation, and how they resist the temptation to treat emotion as proof. The double register supplies a disciplined vocabulary for these realities. It gives believers a way to

speak truthfully without being crude, to long without indulging, to be comforted without being deceived, and to seek union without illusion.

But it only functions as formation when the primary register remains primary. God must be named. Christ must remain central. The gospel narrative must anchor the language. Otherwise the secondary register becomes a projection surface, and what was meant to be worship becomes a mirror.

10.2 The promised outcome: honest intimacy without loss of truth

The promise of recovering this language is not that worship will feel better every week. The promise is not that churches will become more attractive to modern tastes. The promise is not that every believer will have extraordinary experiences. The promised outcome is more modest and more valuable: honest intimacy without loss of truth.

Honest intimacy means the church becomes able again to name what many believers already experience but cannot articulate: fear and drift, longing and dryness, comfort and chastening, desire for refuge and hunger for God. It means believers do not have to live a split life where Sunday speech is sanitized and weekday interior life is unmanaged. It means prayer can sound like an honest human voice rather than a polished script.

Without loss of truth means intimacy is not purchased by vagueness or sentimental denial. God is not reduced to a generic "you." The holiness and otherness of God remain intact. The cross remains central. Repentance remains normal. The fruit test remains decisive. This protects believers from the common modern distortions: worship as emotional consumption, intensity as spiritual authority, and "union talk" that bypasses discipleship.

When this outcome is present, the church gains something priceless: a credible interiority. A community that can speak about God with reverent warmth becomes harder to caricature. It becomes less vulnerable to cynicism. It becomes more capable of pastoral care because it has words that fit the human condition. And it becomes safer, not because it avoids intimacy, but because it disciplines intimacy.

In practical terms, the promised outcome includes a set of visible signs: worship that names Christ clearly and still feels tender; preaching that can handle Song of Songs without embarrassment; discipleship that trains attention and confession; pastoral culture that respects boundaries and trauma histories; and a communal instinct to test experiences by fruit rather than by fervor. These are not aesthetic preferences. They are marks of a community learning to love God with the whole self, in public, without confusion.

10.3 A closing charge: depth with discernment, tenderness with doctrine

The closing charge is directed to churches that sense the hunger for depth but fear the risks. Do not choose shallowness as a safety strategy. Shallow speech does not eliminate longing; it simply abandons longing to other teachers. Do not choose intensity as a shortcut. Intensity does not guarantee truth; it often hides the need for formation. Choose depth with discernment.

Depth with discernment means recovering the double register while refusing its abuses. It means naming God explicitly, keeping metaphors subordinate, and refusing "mood engineering" as the primary strategy of worship. It means teaching believers to welcome consolation without chasing ecstasy, to value holiness over experience, and to measure spiritual health by humility, charity, steadiness, and obedience.

Tenderness with doctrine means refusing the false war between warmth and truth. Doctrine without tenderness becomes brittle and often cruel. Tenderness without doctrine becomes vague and often manipulative. The church's calling is not to pick one; it is to hold both in their proper order: God as God, love as love, truth as truth, and the human heart as something to be formed rather than flattered.

If the church does this, the arts will no longer feel like competitors who "get it" while the church does not. The arts will return to their proper role as allies and witnesses—sometimes prophetic, sometimes corrective, often illuminating—within a community that knows how to interpret them. The church will not need to borrow depth from elsewhere because it will have regained what it already possesses: a language capable of God, reverent enough to protect holiness, intimate enough to speak to longing, and disciplined enough to be audited by fruit.

That is the recovery this paper calls for. Not novelty. Not spectacle. An inheritance made usable again—so that ordinary believers can pray and worship with a full human voice, and yet remain anchored to Christ, shaped by the cross, and guarded from illusion by a communal practice of reverence plus audit.

11. References

11.1 Scripture and primary theological sources

- The Holy Bible. Genesis; Psalms; Song of Songs; Isaiah; Hosea; John; Romans; 1 Corinthians; 2 Corinthians; Ephesians; 1 John; Revelation. (Use the translation actually cited in your final draft, e.g., ESV, NIV, NRSV, KJV.)
- Augustine of Hippo. *Confessions*. (Multiple critical editions and translations; cite the translation you used.)
- Augustine of Hippo. *On Christian Doctrine* (*De doctrina christiana*). (Cite the translation you used.)
- Gregory of Nyssa. *The Life of Moses*. (Cite the translation you used.)
- Pseudo-Dionysius. *The Divine Names*; *Mystical Theology*. (Cite the translation you used.)
- Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologiae*. (Particularly sections on charity, beatitude, prayer, and the virtues; cite the edition/translation you used.)
- Martin Luther. *The Freedom of a Christian*; selected sermons on the Psalms / Gospel of John. (Cite editions used.)
- John Calvin. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. (Cite edition/translation used.)
- Teresa of Avila. *The Life of Teresa of Jesus* (*Vida*) and *The Interior Castle* (written 1577). ICS Publications
- John of the Cross. *Ascent of Mount Carmel*; *Dark Night* (commentary tradition; cite the translation/edition you used). Wikipedia+1

11.2 Hymnody and devotional literature

- Wesley, John, and Wesley, Charles. *Hymns and Sacred Poems*. London: Printed by William Strahan, 1739. Eighteenth-Century Poetry Archive
- Bernard of Clairvaux. *Sermons on the Song of Songs*. Trans. Kilian Walsh, OCSO, and Irene M. Edmonds. (Cistercian Publications; multi-volume set; cite volume(s) used). Liturgical Press
- Origen. *The Song of Songs: Commentary and Homilies*. Trans. and ed. R. P. Lawson. (Ancient Christian Writers, no. 26). (Publisher and year vary by imprint; cite the edition used). Google Books+1
- Kempis, Thomas à. *The Imitation of Christ*. (Cite edition/translation used.)

- Bunyan, John. *The Pilgrim's Progress*. (Cite edition used.)
- Law, William. *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*. (Cite edition used.)
- Brother Lawrence (Nicholas Herman). *The Practice of the Presence of God*. (Cite edition/translation used.)
- Edwards, Jonathan. *Religious Affections*. (Cite edition used.)
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Life Together*; *Letters and Papers from Prison*. (Cite editions used.)
- Lewis, C. S. *The Four Loves*; *Letters to Malcolm: Chiefly on Prayer*. (Cite editions used.)

11.3 Mystical theology and spiritual formation scholarship

- Luhrmann, Tanya M. *When God Talks Back: Understanding the American Evangelical Relationship with God*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012. UW-Madison Libraries
- Willard, Dallas. *The Spirit of the Disciplines: Understanding How God Changes Lives*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988. Dallas Willard
- Foster, Richard J. *Celebration of Discipline: The Path to Spiritual Growth*. (Original publication 1978; cite the edition used). Open Library+1
- Smith, James K. A. *Desiring the Kingdom: Worship, Worldview, and Cultural Formation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2009. Google Books
- Peterson, Eugene H. *Christ Plays in Ten Thousand Places: A Conversation in Spiritual Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005. SAGE Journals+1
- McGinn, Bernard. *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism*. (Multi-volume; cite volume(s) used.)
- Underhill, Evelyn. *Mysticism: A Study in the Nature and Development of Man's Spiritual Consciousness*. (Cite edition used.)
- Ware, Kallistos (Timothy Ware). *The Orthodox Way*; *The Orthodox Church*. (Cite editions used.)
- Lossky, Vladimir. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. (Cite edition used.)
- Nouwen, Henri J. M. *The Return of the Prodigal Son*; *The Way of the Heart*. (Cite editions used.)

11.4 Art history and aesthetics of devotion

- Bernini, Gian Lorenzo. *The Ecstasy of Saint Teresa* (Cornaro Chapel, Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome), completed 1652 (work span commonly dated 1647–1652). Wikipedia+1
- Lavin, Irving. *Bernini and the Unity of the Visual Arts*. New York: Oxford University Press (for the Pierpont Morgan Library), 1980. Google Books+1
- Wittkower, Rudolf; rev. Joseph Connors and Jennifer Montagu. *Art and Architecture in Italy, 1600–1750*. 6th ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999. Colorado Mountain College+1
- Mormando, Franco. *Bernini: His Life and His Rome*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011. University of Chicago Press+1
- Belting, Hans. *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image Before the Era of Art*. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994. Google Books+1
- Panofsky, Erwin. *Meaning in the Visual Arts*; *Studies in Iconology*. (Cite editions used.)
- Baxandall, Michael. *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy*. (Useful for "period eye" and formation by visual culture; cite edition used.)
- Freedberg, David. *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response*. (Cite edition used.)
- Morgan, David. *The Sacred Gaze: Religious Visual Culture in Theory and Practice*. (Cite edition used.)
- Taylor, Mark C. (ed.) or other major surveys on Baroque devotion and Counter-Reformation visual culture (choose the survey you actually used and cite it precisely).

11.5 Psychology of emotion, attention, and religious experience

- James, William. *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (Gifford Lectures, 1901–1902). (Cite the edition used; original commonly dated 1902.) Colorado Mountain College
- Hood, Ralph W., Jr. "The Construction and Preliminary Validation of a Measure of Reported Mystical Experience." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 14, no. 1 (1975): 29–41. ixtheo.de+1
- Kahneman, Daniel. *Attention and Effort*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973. Google Books+1

- Posner, Michael I., and Mary K. Rothbart. *Educating the Human Brain*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2007. Internet Archive+1
- Newberg, Andrew B., Eugene G. D'Aquili, and Vince Rause. *Why God Won't Go Away: Brain Science and the Biology of Belief*. New York: Ballantine Books, 2001. Colorado Mountain College+1
- Barrett, Justin L. *Why Would Anyone Believe in God?* (Cognitive science of religion; cite edition used.)
- Boyer, Pascal. *Religion Explained: The Evolutionary Origins of Religious Thought*. (Cite edition used.)
- Panksepp, Jaak. *Affective Neuroscience: The Foundations of Human and Animal Emotions*. (Cite edition used.)
- Gross, James J. (ed.). *Handbook of Emotion Regulation*. (Cite edition used.)
- Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly. *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. (Useful for absorption/attention and "felt sense" of meaning; cite edition used.)

The author has published over 4,700 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.

Gian Lorenzo Bernini, *Ecstasy of Saint Teresa*, 1647-52 (Cornaro Chapel, Santa Maria della Vittoria, Rome)